Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-94-024
Friday
4 February 1994

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-94-024 *4 February 1994*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.
An Ω indicates a Foreign Media Note.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

France's Leotard, Juppe Call For Strikes on Bosnian Serbs *[AFP]* 1

BULGARIA

Official Denies Talks on Deployment of U.S. Missiles *[Sofia Radio]* 2
Owen Opposes Lifting UN Yugoslav Sanctions *[Sofia Radio]* 2
Calls Ethnic Division of Bosnia 'Only' Alternative *[Sofia Radio]* 2
Ukrainian Ship Refuses Embargo Inspection in Ruse *[Sofia Radio]* 2
No-Confidence Vote in Government Seen as 'Lunacy' *[DUMA 31 Jan]* 2
SDS Role in Improving Ties With Russia Assessed *[OTECHESTVEN VESTNIK 31 Jan]* 3
Government Plans To Sell Uranium Concentrate Abroad *[KONTINENT 1 Feb]* 4

CZECH REPUBLIC

Havel Comments on Russian Changes, Developments *[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY 3 Feb]* 5
Zieleniec on Zhirinovskiy Visit, Nuclear Plant *[Prague Radio]* 5
Zieleniec Terms Kuwait 'Gateway' to Region *[Prague Radio]* 5
UN Envoy: Security Council Has 'Limited Powers' *[Prague Radio]* 5

SLOVAKIA

Government Memorandum on Partnership for Peace *[Bratislava Radio]* 6
Crisis in Parliament Over Privatization Debate *[Prague Radio]* 6
Meciar: Crisis Not Permanent *[Bratislava Radio]* 6
Further Meciar Comment *[Bratislava Radio]* 7
Court Dismisses 'Crisis' *[Bratislava Radio]* 7
Meciar Walks Out of Meeting *[Bratislava Radio]* 8
Meciar Views Relations With President Kovac *[NARODNA OBRODA 3 Feb]* 8
Meciar, Cernak Comment on HZDS-SNS Coalition Talks *[SME 1 Feb]* 8
Meciar Says Dissatisfied Citizens 'Free To Leave' *[NARODNA OBRODA, etc.]* 9
Ministry Official Comments on RFE Discussions *[REPUBLIKA 1 Feb]* 9
Activity of Agency for 'Extraordinary Situations' *[NARODNA OBRODA 1 Feb]* 10
Poll: Over 50% Believe Living Standard Lower *[REPUBLIKA 2 Feb]* 10

HUNGARY

Party Official Criticizes U.S. Report on Human Rights *[Budapest Radio]* 12
Leaders' Roundtable Discussion on Hungary, NATO *[Budapest Radio]* 12
President Announces 8 May Parliamentary Elections *[Budapest Radio]* 14
SZDSZ Chairman Views Relationship With Fidesz *[BESZELO 3 Feb]* 14

POLAND

Pawlak Makes Speech on Signing 'Partnership' *[BIURO PRASOWE RZADU INFORMACJA]* 16
Discontented About 'Partnership' *[Antwerp GAZET VAN ANTWERPEN 3 Feb]* 17
Discusses 'Partnership,' Integration With EU *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 4 Feb]* 17
Talks on Treaty With Lithuania Nearing Completion *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 4 Feb]* 18
Pawlak, Kwasniewski Discuss 'Conflict' *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 4 Feb]* 18
Pawlak, Borowski, Kwasniewski Hold Talks *[Warsaw Radio]* 18

SLD Leader Stresses Coalition Not Threatened *[Warsaw Radio]* 19
SdRP Leader on NATO, European Union, Russia *[Brussels LA LIBRE BELGIQUE 3 Feb]* 19
Poll Author Apologizes for Error in Data *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 3 Feb]* 20
Correction of Error *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 3 Feb]* 20
Right-Wing Coalition Accepts National Party *[Warsaw TV]* 20
Sejm Commission Unyielding on Milewski Appointments *[PAP]* 20
Commission Restores Property to Church *[ZYCIE WARSZAWY 2 Feb]* 21
Strikes Continue in Western Coal Mines *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 3 Feb]* 21
Minister Podkanski Queries GM Contract *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 3 Feb]* 22

ROMANIA

Iliescu Gives Interview to Kiev Daily *[DIMINEATA SUPPLEMENT 29-30 Jan]* 23

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

Izetbegovic Views Tuzla Airport, Croat Army *[Sarajevo Radio]* 29
Izetbegovic Reluctant To Attend Peace Talks *[Sarajevo Radio]* 32
Serbs Demand Control Over Tuzla Airport Traffic *[AFP]* 33
Serbs Accept Truce, Plan 'Mini' Olympics *[TANJUG]* 33
Seven Killed in Shelling of Sarajevo District *[Sarajevo Radio]* 33
Moslems Said To Use Civilians as 'Human Shield' *[TANJUG]* 34
Serbs Say Muslims Fired Two Chemical Bombs *[Belgrade Radio]* 34
UN Commander Asks Croats To Stop Shelling Mostar *[TANJUG]* 34
Sarajevo Radio Reports Shelling 34
Velika Kladusa Officials Ask Rebels To Give Up *[Sarajevo Radio]* 35
WFP Warns of Famine Risk Due to Blocked Convoys *[AFP]* 35

CROATIA

Serbian Sources Claim Croatian Army in Bosnia *[TANJUG]* 36
Prime Minister Denies Troops in Bosnia *[Madrid Radio]* 36
Foreign Minister Denies Presence *[Zagreb TV]* 36
Envoy to UN Comments *[Zagreb Radio]* 37
RSK Seeks Resumption of EU Negotiations *[TANJUG]* 38

SLOVENIA

Zhirinovskiy Views Solutions to Bosnian War *[GLOBUS 4 Feb]* 39

YUGOSLAVIA

Federal

Factories To Receive DM200 Million From State *[POLITIKA 3 Feb]* 42
Ministry Explains Funding *[TANJUG]* 42
Protest To France Over Ban on Pro-Serb Rally *[TANJUG]* 43

Macedonia

Daily Claims U.S. Troops Involved in Incident *[AFP]* 43
Russia Establishes Diplomatic Relations *[MIC 3 Feb]* 43
Diplomatic Relations Established With Czechs *[TANJUG]* 44
Albanians Consider Boycotting Census *[Tirana TV]* 44

France's Leotard, Juppe Call For Strikes on Bosnian Serbs

AU0302152694 Paris AFP in English 1511 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Excerpts] Moscow, Feb 3 (AFP)—Visiting French Defense Minister Francois Leotard on Thursday [3 February] pressed France's call to mount air strikes against Serb forces to open up Tuzla airport in northern Bosnia-Herzegovina.

At the same time, French Foreign Minister Alain Juppe said during a trip to Athens that the facility must be opened within a month.

Leotard briefed Deputy Defense Minister Andrei Kokoshin and Armed Forces Chief of Staff General Mikhail Kolesnikov on the idea of "air strikes at close intervals" so humanitarian aid could be brought in to suffering civilians, but the Russians remained "very cautious," Leotard told a news conference.

However Leotard added that he believed despite "differences in analysing the situation and on what action to take... we are not very far apart." [passage omitted]

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) last month reaffirmed the principle of using air strikes to reopen the airport, if necessary. Since then, Russia, a traditional ally of the Serbs, has come out against the idea.

France thinks "there must be air cover and that if air raids are ever carried out, they must be for protection, not aggression," the defense minister said, but "The Russians think such action could cause a slide into war."

The Russians, who "undoubtedly" have influence over the Serbs, "are very cautious at the moment," he added, but "talks must be continued with them."

Leotard is on a three-day official visit to Russia.

Meanwhile Juppe, on a visit to Athens, set a deadline of about "a month" to reopen Tuzla airport.

During an official 24-hour visit, he said that both that operation and NATO's decision to relieve Canadian UN peacekeepers in the eastern town of Srebrenica, where Serb forces are preventing them from leaving, must "be implemented as quickly as possible."

He said he did not want to name a date because "this would sound like an ultimatum" but that it should be "on the order of a month," adding, "things should move quickly now."

Juppe added, "that's what we're going to try to do Monday" during a meeting of European Community foreign ministers in Brussels.

"If within a month or two," he added, "things have not moved on the diplomatic level, we must really draw conclusions."

Juppe said the belligerents should be given "one last chance to (reach) a political settlement" which could only be based on a peace plan proposed by the European Community, bringing in more directly the United States and Russia.

Greek Foreign Minister Carolos Papoulias said he "agreed entirely" with the idea of carrying out air strikes, but only to bring in aid.

Earlier, international peace negotiators Lord Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg during a visit to Bucharest expressed "full support" for air strikes to protect UN peacekeepers in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Official Denies Talks on Deployment of U.S. Missiles

AU0302143194 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1400 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Deputy Defense Minister Boyko Noev at a briefing today refuted the reports that have appeared in the press, according to which issues related to the deployment of U.S. missiles on Bulgaria territory were discussed during the visit to Bulgaria by the NATO delegation led by Gerhard von Moltke, assistant to the NATO secretary general on political issues.

We did not discuss, even for a moment, the deployment of any heavy weapons, including missiles, on Bulgarian territory, Mr. Noev said categorically. He accused certain daily newspapers of literally lying. Mr. Noev again confirmed that the meetings with the NATO delegation were devoted to specific issues regarding Bulgaria joining the Partnership for Peace plan.

Owen Opposes Lifting UN Yugoslav Sanctions

AU0402112094 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1000 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Report by Vanya Manolova on departure of Lord Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg from Sofia on 4 January, including recorded statement by Owen in response to a correspondent's question—in English fading into Bulgarian translation]

[Text] Lord Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, cochairmen of the international peace conference on the former Yugoslavia, ended their visit to Bulgaria this morning.

In a brief statement prior to their departure, Lord Owen stressed that it is too early to evaluate the results of their tour before they complete their meetings in Tirana and Rome. Lord Owen said that it was his general impression that the voices of the neighbors of the former Yugoslavia, who are suffering serious losses from the Yugoslav embargo, should be heard more loudly and clearly.

Here is what Lord Owen said when asked by a correspondent whether he would support the cancellation of the Yugoslav sanctions:

[Owen] No, I do not favor lifting the sanctions. At this stage, such a step would be premature. Anyway, it is not my job to lift them; it is a matter for the UN Security Council. However, the sanctions were imposed for a specific purpose, and in the final analysis they should serve to achieve this aim. If it becomes clear that there is no way that the sanctions will bring about a settlement, then indeed it will be necessary to raise the question of lifting them.

Calls Ethnic Division of Bosnia 'Only' Alternative

AU0302181394 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1700 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Lord David Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, the cochairmen of the international conference on solving the Yugoslav crisis, have arrived in Sofia on their tour of former Yugoslavia's neighboring countries.

They had talks with Stanislav Daskalov, minister of foreign affairs, while their meeting with President Zhelev is still in progress.

After the meeting with Daskalov, Lord Owen pointed out, in reply to a journalist's question, that he has never abandoned the original plan to solve the Balkan conflict, and that the plan to divide Bosnia-Herzegovina into three parts on the basis of ethnic principles has recently emerged as the only possible alternative for a peaceful solution of the problems.

Ukrainian Ship Refuses Embargo Inspection in Ruse

AU0302190494 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 1600 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] An Ukrainian cargo ship refused to stop at Ruse port, as we have just learned from our local correspondent Natasha Dimitrova.

The ship is called Khabarovsk and is transporting six barges of iron ore for the port of Linz.

Around 2300 local time (2100 GMT] on 1 February, the vessel's captain, in a telephone conversation, refused to obey the order of the officials on duty from the Bulgarian State Navigation Inspectorate to stop and await the embargo investigation.

According to the latest instructions, such an investigation should take place during the day. The captain explained that he was in a hurry for the obligatory investigation that was awaiting him in Calafat.

The investigation teams in Calafat, where the ship is expected to arrive tomorrow morning, were briefed on the case.

No-Confidence Vote in Government Seen as 'Lunacy'

AU0302155694 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 31 Jan 94 p 12

[Commentary by Boyka Bashlieva: "The SDS Is Again Pretending That It Is Toppling Berov"]

[Text] For the fifth time since Berov's government was elected, the parliamentary faction of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS], instructed by the SDS National Coordinating Council, has decided to bring down the government through a no-confidence vote. Nevertheless, despite the fact that this was reported on the front pages

of all the newspapers, it failed to impress anyone and the chances of success are very close to zero.

The most frequent explanation of the no-confidence vote proposal, which could be heard last week in political circles, was that this is an attempt to delay the adoption of the 1994 budget. Two sessions will certainly be wasted, which still does not mean that the budget debate could not start as soon as this week.

Some of the SDS deputies did not tire of repeating that the purpose of the proposal was to topple the cabinet and bring forward the elections. However, when asked about the real reason, another section of deputies only shrug their shoulders and develop a great interest in their shoelaces. This is so because, if anyone really wanted to topple Berov, the SDS leadership would have proposed the no-confidence vote after rather than prior to adopting the budget. Perhaps then the chances would not have been so close to zero as they are now.

Unlike previous reasons that prompted no-confidence votes, such as the "beating" of Stefan Savov, the sidewalk taxes, and other such lunacies, this time things are more serious. Burgeoning crime and the police shoot-out could easily generate enough votes against the government. However, this will not happen when the country is without a budget. Even a child could understand the economic consequences of such a situation.

If we assume that this is, nevertheless, unclear to some SDS deputies (which is highly questionable), then we would have to believe the thesis that they repeat ad nauseam, namely, that the government, only the government, and no one but the government is responsible for the crime rate, and if the government is brought down and new elections emerge on the horizon, the sticks and the firearms on our streets will disappear, and the same will happen to the vicious fight between economic groups and to corruption. In other words, life will become as pretty as a picture.

This is more than absurd. There is no more fertile soil for the crime, corruption, and anarchy than the absence of laws, a legislating institution, and an executive institution responsible for implementing the laws. It is a completely different question as to how the cabinet and parliament cope with their obligations.

In addition, if the Socialists boycott the voting, something that was mentioned over the weekend, the no-confidence motion will not gain the 121 votes required by the Constitution, and the thesis that "by supporting the government the Bulgarian Socialist Party is supporting crime," will vanish into thin air.

Thus, regardless of which direction the no-confidence vote is viewed, it always looks like total lunacy.

SDS Role in Improving Ties With Russia Assessed

AU0302153894 Sofia OTECHESTVEN VESTNIK in Bulgarian 31 Jan 94 p 1

[Commentary by Poli Vasileva: "Russian Card"]

[Text] Can the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] overcome the stagnation in Bulgarian-Russian relations? At first glance the answer is no. There are several reasons for this. The SDS coalition is not in power and does have the necessary levers to directly affect official relations with the Kremlin. The natural anti-Soviet tendencies among the supporters of the blue [SDS] coalition are interpreted in Moscow by some "well-wishers" as hatred for the Russian people. The current government is the hostage of business groups that rely on the chaotic interstate relations and the paralysis of the Bulgarian Embassy in Moscow, in which there has been no ambassador for the last two years, in order to monopolize trade with the former USSR. The suspicion that KGB structures played an active role in toppling Filip Dimitrov's government is well-grounded.

Recently, however, one could also observe different processes. They provide certain commentators sensitive to Bulgarian-Russian relations with an opportunity to assume that we could soon see a sharp change in those relations. It is not very plausible to assume that the Bulgarian neocommunists will play a fundamental role in this process. Russian President Boris Yeltsin clearly implied this last year, when he refused to receive Bulgarian Prime Minister Lyuben Berov. This was a diplomatic slap in the face not only for the government of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] and the Movement for Rights and Freedoms [DPS], but mainly for President Zhelev, who is Berov's patron.

It was only the SDS that issued a fundamental position against the participants in the coup against Yeltsin, when the Russian Parliament was dissolved. This was done without waiting for a favorable outcome of the events. A bit later reports emerged about unofficial contacts between SDS figures and Yeltsin's advisers. Last week it became clear that the talks on Filip Dimitrov's visit to Russia have made progress. We also learned that intelligence chief Brigo Asparukhov visited Moscow with the purpose of foiling the contacts between the blue coalition and Russia's liberal circles.

After the failure of this mission (General Asparukhov was recalled to Bulgaria on 21 January before the end of his visit), three other persons who are very close to President Zhelev—Ivan Krustev, Deyan Kyuranov, and Evgeniy Daynov—departed for Moscow. It is indicative that on this occasion the president sent more intelligent advisers who do not hide a certain sympathy for the SDS and its leader.

Will Dimitrov succeed in making a new beginning in Bulgarian-Russian relations? One should first answer the main question: Is the "northern bear" prepared to seek

friendship this time rather than control? For the time being everything is in the realm of initial positive signals. However, it is clear that the democrats in both countries already understand that the stagnation in the two countries' relations serves only the forces of restoration and organized crime.

Government Plans To Sell Uranium Concentrate Abroad

AU0302174394 Sofia KONTINENT in Bulgarian 1 Feb 94 p 1

[Report by Tatyana Mitova]

[Text] Sofia, 31 January—Within the next few days, the government will decide what to do with the 500 metric tons of uranium concentrate that is stockpiled in two stores in the Rhodopes. The general view is that the material should leave the country in the very near future.

According to one of the proposals to unload the material, the Russian firm of Tekhnosnabeksport, acting as an agent, would acquire the concentrate at $17 per kilogram, and then sell fuel rods filled with the uranium to the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Station for $27.20 each. The price reportedly includes the cost of shipping, safeguarding, and storing the rods.

In the view of experts specializing in this market, which is monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the uranium concentrate will be sold for $26.59 per kilogram.

On the free market the prices are lower, ranging from $18.44 to $19.35.

The cost of producing uranium in Bulgaria ranges from $202 to $73, and is on average 4.5 times higher that free market prices.

Before the uranium industry was shut down, Bulgaria produced about 250 tons of concentrate per year, which satisfied 35 percent of its own needs. These 250 tons can be used to generate 8.4 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity per year.

There are two possibilities for supplying the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Station with nuclear fuel. The first is to buy uranium rods filled with Russian fuel, and the second is to fill the rods with Bulgarian material.

Experts claim that then a kilowatt-hour of electric power would be 166 times more expensive.

The Council of Ministers will designate the organizations that will engage in putting the uranium concentrate onto the international market. One of the possibilities is the state company Rudmetal, another is the private Intersteel company, which belongs to Multigroup.

Havel Comments on Russian Changes, Developments

AU0402124894 Prague HOSPODARSKE NOVINY in Czech 3 Feb 94 p 3

[CTK report: "Vaclav Havel's Empathies and Wishes"]

[Text] Prague—At a meeting yesterday with the press at Prague Castle, President Vaclav Havel, among other things, expressed his empathy with the reform efforts by the former Russian first deputy prime minister, Yegor Gaydar, and former Finance Minister Boris Fyodorov. He hopes that the current changes in Russia will not translate into a freeze or halt the reforms. "If they (the reforms) were to stop halfway, it could be worse than if they were not implemented at all," he emphasized.

Havel, who assumed the post of president of the Czech Republic just a year ago, was also asked what developments he would wish for. "Regarding our Republic, I would like the economic transformation to be successfully completed, our country to be politically stable and quickly integrated into the European structures. I would like a civic society to flourish here, and decency, gentlemanliness, and political culture be enhanced here," Havel answered.

Zieleniec on Zhirinovskiy Visit, Nuclear Plant

LD0302173094 Prague Radiozurnal Radio Network in Czech 1600 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Excerpts] Foreign Minister Josef Zieleniec gave a news conference in the Mirror Hall of the Cernin Palace in Prague. David Stahlavsky was present on behalf of Czech Radio Radiozurnal.

[Stahlavsky] [passage omitted] Josef Zieleniec does not believe that the visit by Russian nationalist Vladimir Zhirinovskiy to the Czech Republic is imminent. Vladimir Zhirinovskiy was invited by the Association for the Republic-Republican Party of Czechoslovakia. The minister is surprised that Zhirinovskiy, who professed the demise of the Czech Republic recently and made improper remarks about our country, could have been invited by anyone. He said he found it difficult to understand this.

The foreign minister responded also to the Austrian effort to block the American guarantees for the completion of the Temelin nuclear power plant [south Bohemia] and to the Vienna government's endeavors to stop this construction altogether.

[Begin Zieleniec recording] Our course of action is not only in line with the law, it is also fair to our neighbors. It is neither the fault of our nuclear power plant nor of anyone else that Austria has to cope with the preelection situation. Of course, we keep in touch with the Austrian Government. We try to explain to them that these matters create unnecessary tension in our neighborly relations and that there is no need for such a spectacular approach. It is a pity. I sincerely regret that irrational elements emerge in our relations with Austria. [end recording]

Zieleniec Terms Kuwait 'Gateway' to Region

LD0402003894 Prague Stanice Praha Radio Network in Czech 2130 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Excerpts] A news conference by Foreign Minister Josef Zieleniec took place today in the Mirror Hall of the Cernin Palace. David Stahlavsky reports.

[Begin Stahlavsky recording] [passage omitted] Czech Foreign Minister Josef Zieleniec mentioned the coming state visit by President Vaclav Havel to India and Thailand. The foreign minister, together with Finance Minister Ivan Kocarnik and Deputy Industry and Trade Minister Sabela, will accompany the president.

[Zieleniec] This visit is important for us not only from the viewpoint of publicity and symbolism but also from the practical viewpoint with regard to developing trade contacts with this region.

[Stahlavsky] Czech radio asked Zieleniec why President Havel, on his return from Thailand to Prague, is stopping in Kuwait for brief talks. The foreign minister answered:

[Zieleniec] Precisely because we want to use this opportunity to emphasize contacts with Gulf countries. In principle, Kuwait is very close to us. We have had intensive contacts since the Gulf war, as well as rather good political, and particularly, trade contacts, and for us Kuwait is a kind of gateway to this region. As foreign minister, I must say that Kuwait's diplomacy has always been very helpful in opening up new roads for us into that area and, above all, has behaved always in a very friendly manner toward us. These are the reasons we will make a stopover there. We will also use this opportunity to have talks with the highest representatives.

UN Envoy: Security Council Has 'Limited Powers'

LD0402112194 Prague Radiozurnal Radio Network in Czech 0900 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] According to Karel Kovanda, Czech ambassador to the United Nations, who chaired the UN Security Council in January, peacekeeping by the United Nations is a question for the distant future.

Karel Kovanda sees his success and that of Czech foreign policy in the Security Council mainly in the fact that the other countries view the Czech Republic different from the way they did a month ago. Kovanda said that he purposely managed to cut down the length of the council's meetings but increased their efficiency.

He said it is a hard fact of the present world that the council has only limited powers that could be further curtailed by the decreasing interest of the individual states in supporting the council by, for example, being reluctant to offer their soldiers for service.

Government Memorandum on Partnership for Peace

LD0302141294 Bratislava Rozhlasova Stanica Slovensko Network in Slovak 1100 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] A while ago we received from the Foreign Affairs Ministry a Slovak Government memorandum on our country joining the Partnership for Peace program.

The memorandum points out that the NATO summit brought closer the prospects of Slovakia's full incorporation into a developed Europe, including the economic, political, and security aspects thereof. The summit has offered further possibilities of involvement in setting up new models of cooperation within Europe by supporting the development of the European security and defense (?identity).

The Slovak Republic is aware that the development of security mechanisms is a process. These mechanisms will guarantee stability on the continent. This has been reflected in the proposals and programs put forward by the Brussels summit. The Slovak Republic will continue to pursue its initiatives aimed at obtaining full NATO membership, as well as the security guarantees that are needed for successful completion of the economic transformation and the strengthening of democracy, says the Slovak Government's memorandum about [Slovakia] joining the Partnership for Peace program.

Crisis in Parliament Over Privatization Debate

LD0302213894 Prague Radiozurnal Radio Network in Czech 1700 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] [Announcer] The Slovak parliament was scheduled to discuss the so-called draft law on large-scale privatization today. However, the debate did not happen. More from our colleague, editor of the weekly PRACE Renata Havranova.

[Havranova] Today was a tense, chaotic, and at times very undignified day for the deputies of the Slovak parliament. After a three-hour long delay, the session started with an argument about who was entitled to chair it. The deputies voted to take away the right of chairing the session from Ivan Gasparovic [chairman of the National Council of the Slovak Republic] for failing to keep time and authorized Ludovit Cernak [chairman of the Slovak National Party and deputy chairman of parliament] to do so. Gasparovic protested that only he, as chairman of parliament, had the right to call and chair the session. He therefore announced a recess.

Prime Minister Meciar, who wanted to withdraw the bill on large-scale privatization but failed, demonstratively left the chamber [declaring] that he did not accept the chairmanship of Ludovit Cernak.

Since morning, the game in parliament was all about nerves and time. The coalition, in an attempt to equalize the voting score of opposition, is alleged to have brought by police helicopter Deputy [Peter] Brnak [Slovak National Party (SNS)] from medical treatment and Augustin Marian Huska [Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (HZDS)], who is in serious medical condition, straight from the hospital. Even so, they did not match the opposition votes.

In the meantime, the cross-party parliamentary standing committee decided to continue the debate. Soon after the opening, deputy [Tibor] Cabaj from the HZDS announced that the coalition clubs of deputies considered the withdrawal of Ivan Gasparovic's right to chair the debate to be anticonstitutional and therefore proposed that the matter be decided by the Constitutional Court. Until its decision, the HZDS deputies and some of SNS deputies would not be taking part in parliamentary meetings. Deputies of both parliamentary clubs then left the chamber.

The remaining deputies took strong exception to such procedure. They said that it was an intentional attempt to avoid a debate on such a very important law as was the law on large-scale privatization.

For Slovakia, it was tragic behavior. According to the opposition deputies, the principle of parliamentarism was put in doubt, and that was particularly dangerous for Slovakia in the present political situation. The majority of the cross-party standing committee that met after this situation had arisen, agreed to adjourn the meeting until tomorrow morning.

Meciar: Crisis Not Permanent

LD0302224794 Bratislava Rozhlasova Stanica Slovensko Network in Slovak 1730 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] [Announcer] At a brief news conference, we asked Vladimir Meciar, chairman of the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia [HZDS] and Slovak prime minister:

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Prime minister, what will your movement propose to other parliamentary parties at the meeting of the cross-party standing committee [gremium] tomorrow [4 February, following today's parliamentary crisis]?

[Meciar] We will address the basics. The basis of the problem is the fact that the parliament chairman was stripped of his rights in an unconstitutional way [deputies voted that the deputy chairman should chair the session today]. The essence of the problem lies in the fact that this parliament has been deliberately led into crisis for a long time now. They try to change election results so that the structure of parliament changes. That is immoral and politically wrong. There cannot be two moral codes in parliament. One has to dig even deeper into the efficiency of this political system that has emerged in parliament. For example, when voting, let us say in the cross-party standing committee, everyone stands for one political entity. Thus, the antigovernment coalition has the majority. In reality, though, with the

number of votes, it represents a minority. They [the antigovernment coalition] cannot assume a majority stance on some issues.

We have to make it clear what the position of Ludovit Cernak, the National Council's [parliament] deputy chairman is. He became deputy chairman on the basis of the coalition agreement, which he later trampled on. Does he have any moral or political right to be a deputy chairman of the National Council? This question has to be resolved as well.

It is not our intention to create a crisis at any cost in the way the opposition is trying to do. The whole opposition is trying to do so, including Peter Weiss [chairman of the Party of the Democratic Left]. Our aim is to find a model for cooperation. We will either cooperate or let us confess to citizens that we are not able to do so. Let them then choose from among us with whom they want to cooperate. This situation has been coming to a head for a long time now, several months now. I still do not consider this to be a critical moment. I consider it to be an element of the first conflict, which will still be resolved. However, if essential, deeper, systemic changes are not adopted, there is a danger that the crisis will recur. It might change into a permanent parliamentary crisis. That, already, is a very serious matter.

[Unidentified correspondent] At the moment, there is in fact a stalemate in parliament—75 for and 75 against. Do you think the National Council will be able to continue discussing the government bill [on large-scale privatization] tomorrow?

[Meciar] It is not appropriate that I should take a stance on parliamentary matters from my position as a Cabinet member. I would rather speak on behalf of the HZDS movement. There is no stalemate [in parliament]; the balance is still in our [government coalition's] favor. We do not do this out of fear. We have the majority in parliament, even the majority needed to adopt necessary laws, as the law on large-scale privatization is.

[Unidentified correspondent] One lady deputy allegedly left the HZDS yesterday?

[Meciar] I do not know anything about that.

[Unidentified correspondent] Did you change your opinion on early elections after what happened today?

[Meciar] My opinion remains the same. First, those who left their [deputies'] clubs—namely, nine deputies from the HZDS, several SNS deputies who left for the so-called national democratic [club]—should leave their seats in parliament. The citizens voted for particular parties. The election system is based on parties.

Therefore, it will be one of our duties to initiate a change, both through a bill on internal affairs and by asking the citizens to petition and support the referendum, which would decide on this matter. If the referendum fails, the next option for a solution, in my opinion, would be early parliamentary elections. However, I still prefer other options—i.e., I prefer tackling the internal situations in deputies' clubs in harmony with the election law and not in the spirit of two moral codes, two sets of rules, two approaches regardless of the law. That would be dishonest. [end recording]

Further Meciar Comment

LD0302231694 Bratislava Rozhlasova Stanica Slovensko Network in Slovak 2030 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] As we have already informed you, the 26th session of the National Council was suspended today following the walkout of the HZDS [Movement for a Democratic Slovakia] deputies and some SNS [Slovak National Party] deputies. Subsequently, the opposition deputies were unable to start discussing their version of the large-scale privatization law. The parliament session might continue on 4 February, following a consultative meeting of the parliamentary parties' officials. It is still possible that the deputies of the ruling coalition will change their decision about not attending the parliament's deliberations until a decision is reached by the Constitutional Court on whether it was legal to deprive parliament Chairman Ivan Gasparovic of the chairmanship of today's session.

As HZDS chairman, Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar told TA SR [Press Agency of the Slovak Republic] that the Constitution clearly defines the powers of the chairman of the National Council. Therefore, Meciar considers the vote on whether Gasparovic should chair the session to be an informal vote of no-confidence in Ivan Gasparovic and an effort to question his honor.

According to Vladimir Meciar, the initiative of the HZDS deputies and some SNS deputies to turn to the Constitutional Court is correct. He stressed that the issue was not the chairmanship of the session; it was the issue of respecting constitutional principles.

Court Dismisses 'Crisis'

LD0302234394 Bratislava Rozhlasova Stanica Slovensko Network in Slovak 1730 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Milan Cic, chairman of the Slovak Constitutional Court, spoke to the Press Agency of the Slovak Republic about his stand on today's events in parliament. He said that his post as chairman of the Constitutional Court does not give him the right to interpret the Constitution on his own. However, he perceives the entire problem as predominantly a political conflict. Therefore, it should be tackled using political means and forms—first at a session of the cross-party standing committee chaired by the chairman, at meetings of deputies' clubs, through the cooperation of the clubs chairmen, at the level of committees and political bodies—and only if this fails should the issue be presented to a plenary session [of parliament] or, if need be, to the Constitutional Court.

Milan Cic does not perceive the current situation in parliament as a parliamentary crisis or even a constitutional crisis. It is a misunderstanding that can be overcome provided there is goodwill, the chairman of the Constitutional Court stressed.

Meciar Walks Out of Meeting

LD0402103694 Bratislava Rozhlasova Stanica Slovensko Network in Slovak 0900 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] The beginning of today's deliberations of the 26th session of the National Council scheduled for 0900 hours was postponed. First deputy chairman Peter Weiss told the deputies who were present that parliament chairman Ivan Gasparovic had left the parliament building together with Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar immediately after the unsuccessful talks held by the representatives of parliamentary parties this morning.

According to TA SR [Slovak news agency], this meeting had in effect ended after the prime minister refused to join the talks because Milan Knazko, chairman of the Alliance of Democrats, was present at the meeting. Vladimir Meciar does not recognize Milan Knazko as an elected parliamentary representative. Because the representatives of parliamentary parties refused to accept Meciar's request that Milan Knazko should leave the meeting, Vladimir Meciar said, according to parliament deputy chairman Ludovit Cernak, that the meeting was not legitimate and was anticonstitutional. Immediately after that, Vladimir Meciar left the room.

Meciar Views Relations With President Kovac

AU0402151094 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 3 Feb 94 p 3

[Statement by Slovak Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar; place and date not given: "The Prime Minister About Relations with the President"—reprinted from an undated issue of EXTRA SLOVENSKO weekly in the "Who, What, Where—Said, Wrote" column]

[Text] On the whole, I can say that we, with Mr. President [Michal Kovac], have working relations, and I do not believe that we have different political objectives. I am afraid that the president is not the only person responsible for the tense atmosphere. Do you want an example? We used to share a box in the Slovak National Theater and it did not bother anyone. Suddenly, however, some people came from the Chancellery of the President of the Slovak Republic maintaining that the prime minister and the parliament chairman [Ivan Gasparovic] have no place in the box. (By the way, I used it only on the occasion of the funeral of Roman Zelenay because I simply do not have time for such perfunctory actions). Eventually, they came up with the idea that the box would have three doors. It was not technically feasible. Thus, they arrived at the idea that the president must have a higher chair. I replied with a recommendation that they do not raise the president's chair, but rather saw off the legs of the chairs for Gasparovic and myself.... The staff of the Chancellery of the President determines the flow and content of information reaching his person. The later the president realizes this, the worse for him. A more fortunate solution for the president would be the employment of nonpartisan, neutral experts. I will not give any details regarding the reason for the current state of the president-prime-ministerial relations at this time, although they are obvious not only to me, but also to the president and the parliament chairman. We are in complete agreement with Mr. Gasparovic.

Meciar, Cernak Comment on HZDS-SNS Coalition Talks

AU0402121094 Bratislava SME in Slovak 1 Feb 94 pp 1-2

[Article by "mh": "Vladimir Meciar: The Movement for a Democratic Slovakia Knows Who Its Coalition Partner Is"]

[Text] Bratislava—During yesterday's coalition talks, the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia [HZDS] and the Slovak National Party [SNS] agreed to seek a compromise solution with regard to the amendment to the law on large-scale privatization. At a joint meeting with the Party of the Democratic Left [SDL] Club of Deputies, the coalition partners want to accommodate SDL demands and thus achieve the submission of a single draft amendment. As Prime Minister Meciar noted, the only issue of dispute between the government-sponsored draft and the SDL deputies' draft is the combining of government posts with positions in the National Property Fund (FNM). Asked when the talks with the SDL Club of Deputies would be held, Vladimir Meciar replied: "Who knows? They may be under way already." As SDL Chairman Peter Weiss told SME shortly after the conclusion of the coalition talks, so far he had not received any official offer for talks with the coalition on the amendment to the law on large-scale privatization. As for the SDL's own draft, they stick to their positions. Weiss said that it was unacceptable and unconstitutional to combine government posts with FNM posts and that he did not see any possibility of reaching an agreement on this point.

At their talks yesterday, the coalition representatives returned to the nonacceptance of the so-called law on [bilingual] signposts [by Slovak Parliament on 28 January]. According to Vladimir Meciar, the government can submit it again to parliament for another discussion in six months at the earliest.

As Vladimir Meciar reported further, the coalition partners dealt with the existence or nonexistence of the so-called SNS National Democratic Club [of SNS Chairman Ludovit Cernak] in the National Council of the Slovak Republic. According to the HZDS chairman's words, the HZDS upholds the opinion that it signed the coalition agreement with the SNS Central Council, which is the partner for the HZDS. This partner announced that there exists only one SNS Club of Deputies, so the HZDS has no doubt as to who its coalition partner is.

SNS Chairman Ludovit Cernak told SME in this context that, during the coalition talks, he had advised Vladimir Meciar to read carefully what he signs. According to Cernak, the coalition agreement was signed by two legal entities—the HZDS and the SNS. Ludovit Cernak confirmed that the existence of the SNS National Democratic Club had been a subject of the coalition talks. The participants did not arrive at a final stand, however, because, according to Ludovit Cernak, a meeting of coalition partners is not a forum that is entitled to assess the founding of the SNS National Democratic Club. As he went on to say, in this context, the promise could be heard from the other participants that, if members of the SNS National Democratic Club gave up their SNS membership, the establishment of the SNS National Democratic Club would be respected. The SNS chairman rejected this offer. He said that he would continue to participate in the coalition talks in line with the decision of the SNS Central Council.

Meciar Says Dissatisfied Citizens 'Free To Leave'

AU0402120694

[Editorial Report] Slovak newspapers on 3 February publish TA SR and correspondents' reports, ranging from 300 to 500 words, on statements made by Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar at a rally of Movement for a Democratic Slovakia [HZDS] supporters in Bratislava's Park of Culture and Repose on 2 February.

Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak on 3 February on page 13 carries a 500-word Bohumil Olach report entitled "Will There Be a Referendum Against Knazko's Followers?" The report includes the following passage: "In the first round of replies to questions from the audience, the prime minister said that he will not hold talks on collective rights for the Hungarian minority because, in Cyprus, too, it once started with collective rights and ultimately led to a war between Turkey and Greece. He who feels bad here is absolutely free to leave, he said, for which he earned great applause. He also touched on the differences of views between the government and the president on some issues. He said, for example, that it is not good when the president and the government both push for their own version of the law on names and surnames. The opposition operates with the cliche that everything will be better without Meciar, he continued. The president has called for the formation of a multicolor government, but the Party of the Democratic Left [SDL] is ready to talk [about joining the government coalition] only when there will be early elections. The Christian Democratic Movement [KDH] and the Alliance of Democrats [AD] only want an agreement without Meciar. "And the president said that they must be accommodated," the prime minister added.

"The president was awarded with 'Phooey!' and the chanting of 'Shame!' from a group of enraged women in the left corner of the audience in front of the stage. No one made an attempt to silence them."

Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak on 3 February on page 3 carries a 500-word Martin Krno report entitled "Our Mr. Meciar." The PRAVDA correspondent observes that, in addition to the "traditional" criticism of "the Hungarians, the Czechs, the correspondents, the head of state, and the opposition," the participants in the rally "heard also something new from the prime minister's mouth. According to the prime minister, the ruling movement is increasingly consolidated. If parliament does not approve a law under which all 'disobedient' deputies must surrender their seats, a referendum will decide on this issue. Three large electoral blocs are taking shape, the prime minister said: 1. The SDL, Social Democrats, and farmers; 2. The KDH, Conservative Democratic Party, and Knazko's followers; and 3. The HZDS, together with the anti-Cernak part of the Slovak National Party, Klepac's Christian Social Union (frenetic applause), and, possibly, the Greens. It goes without saying that this last bloc will be victorious again."

Bratislava REPUBLIKA in Slovak on 3 February on page 2 carries a 300-word TA SR report entitled "Vladimir Meciar: Devaluation Is Not Being Prepared." According to the report, Meciar told the meeting of 2,000 Bratislava residents that "no devaluation is being prepared, fares will not go up, and the government will do everything within its power to accelerate the sale of [community-owned] apartments into citizens' private ownership." He reportedly also "rejected speculations that the government might tender its resignation and denied reports that he is divorcing his wife."

Ministry Official Comments on RFE Discussions

AU0302180394 Bratislava REPUBLIKA in Slovak 1 Feb 94 p 4

[Statement by Ivan Vaclavik, press spokesman for the Slovak Ministry of Transport, Communications, and Public Works: "Split Time for the RFE"]

[Text] The exhausting 11-hour talks, from 0900 to 2100 [as published], only confirmed that Radio Free Europe's [RFE] broadcasting in Slovakia is a complex technical and legal issue. Even RFE Deputy Director Gary Thatcher agreed when Vladimir Zeman, the director general of the Communications Section at the Slovak Ministry of Transport, Communications, and Public Works, emphasized that not once during the several-hour talks was it mentioned that it is a political matter. The participants in the talks between the RFE and Slovak Telecommunications expressed it even in the accord memorandum, and both interested parties can now peacefully concentrate on the technical side of RFE broadcasting in Slovakia.

The Frequencies Situation Is Becoming Clear

It should be noted that the Geneva plan originally assigned the 1287 kHz frequency on medium-wave to transmitters in the Czech Republic, while the 1521 kHz frequency is

used by Slovak transmitters. There is just one catch. Presov was assigned the same frequency as the Czech transmitters, while the "Slovak" frequency has also been assigned to the Ostrava transmitter. However, everything was settled at the talks between the Slovak Ministry of Transport, Communications, and Public Works and the Czech Economics Ministry. Both parties agreed there that the 1287 frequency belongs to the Czech Republic and the 1521 frequency belongs to Slovakia. That is the precise reason the Slovak Telecommunications offered the RFE a different frequency on the AM band. But the RFE representatives do not want it.

They Insist on the Original Contract

They insist on the original contract even though the Slovak side points out that the RFE broadcasts in Slovakia on a frequency that does not belong to us. Hence, the broadcast is illegal. Eventually, the two interested parties agreed that Slovak Telecommunications will apply through the Ministry of Transport, Communications, and Public Works at the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) in Geneva for an investigation of the entire affair, and its decision should then be sufficient reason to change the contract in effect. Because of this, Slovak Telecommunications retracted its original decision on the termination on 31 January 1994 of RFE broadcasting in Slovakia from the transmitters in Presov, Poprad, and Velke Kostolany.

They Insist on 1287 kHz

It is in the interest of the Slovak Republic that the entire broadcast network be placed in line with the law as soon as possible. The RFE representatives have opposed all of the provisions, however, and that made the talks difficult. It is paradoxical that the Slovak side kept offering a different wavelength on the AM band but the RFE insists on the 1287 kHz. Why has it remained obfuscated?

According to RFE Deputy Director Gary Thatcher, they heard the arguments that the current contract could cause a conflict in international agreements in the context of the assigned frequencies. They acknowledged (several proposals by the Slovak party on) the possible ways to settle these problems. The RFE is still willing to take part in the search for a solution that would satisfy both parties. Thatcher indicated that one feasible solution could be a change of the frequency for the RFE programs.

So far, however, as RFE Slovak Broadcast Director Ivan Cikl phrased it, "We (the RFE—editorial note) are convinced that the contract is valid until the end of 1995, and one of its articles even refers to the possibility of further expanding the term of its validity."

In any event, it is important that RFE broadcasting reaches the legal status required by international regulations.

Activity of Agency for 'Extraordinary Situations'

AU0302135194 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 1 Feb 94 p 2

[Article by "eb": "For Extraordinary Situations; Slovakia, Too, Has a State Material Reserves Administration"]

[Text] Bratislava—One of the central bodies of state administration that had to be established in the independent Slovak Republic following the partition of the CSFR is the State Material Reserves Administration (SSHR) of the Slovak Republic, the founder of which is the government. The Administration is made up of eight organizational units, four warehouses, and EAN [European Article Numbering] Slovakia, a budget-funded organization. The SSHR employs 200 people.

As SSHR Chairman Peter Ryska stressed at a news conference yesterday, it is not necessary to keep the SSHR's existence and operations secret, as was the case until recently. Quite the contrary, citizens should know that there exists a state agency, whose objective it is, in cooperation with individual government departments (economy, health care, transportation, and so forth), to secure an adequate level of supplies in order to ensure the operation of the economy and to supply the population with vital basic provisions in extraordinary situations (natural disasters, epidemics, local conflicts, and the like). The state material reserves consist of several thousand items, among which are, for example, fuels, cereals, pharmaceuticals, staple foods, industrial raw materials, and nonferrous metals. Essential food reserves are generated so as to last 10 days and fuel reserves so as to last up to 40 days. As transpired from SSHR Chairman Peter Ryska's words, however, even this specific agency must today contend with a deficit, which amounts to 200 million korunas. With respect to some items, the SSHR's budget does not reach even 50 percent of the 1993 level.

The SSHR regards as its priorities this year the approval of the bill on state material reserves and the passage of the law on mandatory reserves of oil, oil products, and the distribution system. The task for the next few years will be to follow the example of advanced countries and to transfer the burden for generating material reserves from the state to producers and retailers and, with respect to specific reserves, such as staple foods, for example, to the population.

Poll: Over 50% Believe Living Standard Lower

AU0302175894 Bratislava REPUBLIKA in Slovak 2 Feb 94 p 3

[TA SR report: "Public Opinion in Statistical Figures"]

[Text] Bratislava—In opinion polls conducted by the Slovak Statistical Office in December 1993, a total of 13 percent of the respondents said that their standard of living was better than in the same period in 1992. Compared with the results obtained in September 1992,

when 10 percent said the standard of living had improved, this is a slightly positive trend. A total of 29 percent of respondents said in December 1993 that their standard of living did not change—32 percent of respondents responded the same in September 1992. In both cases, 58 percent of respondents described their standard of living as deteriorating.

The polls have shown that people view the standard of living depending on political preferences, education, and membership in social and professional groups. There was a relatively higher percentage of respondents who said that their standard of living was improving in the group of sympathizers with the Movement for Democratic Slovakia sympathizers (25 percent) and the Slovak National Party (18 percent).

Party Official Criticizes U.S. Report on Human Rights

LD0302192694 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 1700 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] The Hungarian Justice and Life Party considers that in our country human rights are violated only in that the administration of justice is slow and those who have fired the volleys are not brought in front of the judges. Therefore, Istvan Csurka, cochairman, considers the regular annual report of the U.S. State Department, which refers to shortcomings in Hungarian press freedom and the enforcement of minority rights, one-sided and biased.

Leaders' Roundtable Discussion on Hungary, NATO

LD0302210794 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 2005 GMT 2 Feb 94

[Roundtable discussion in the "World Studio" program entitled "NATO, the Promised Land, Viewed From the East" with Geza Jeszenszky, Hungarian foreign minister; Gyula Horn, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Party; Gyula Kodolanyi, state secretary and foreign political adviser to the prime minister; and Jozsef Szajer, leader of the foreign policy group of the Alliance of Young Democrats; moderator not identified—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Moderator] Let us start with the question of whether Hungary is threatened by any outside danger, and from this point of view, just how necessary this NATO membership is.

[Jeszenszky] Perhaps I shall start, since at present I am responsible, with several of my colleagues, for the security of the country. I think that at the moment, no direct danger threatens us. I do not know of a country which would want to attack Hungary with its soldiers and army.

However, Hungary has been occupied several times in the 20th century. [passage omitted] I think even a child knows in Hungary that in the past 50 years in Europe, peace was saved by NATO. Thus, in Europe, NATO is the only effective security organization in possession of armies and forces; I think it is totally understandable that I would like to see Hungary in NATO.

[Horn] I agree with the foreign minister that there is no immediate danger. It is my conviction that none of our neighbors would have any reason or perhaps means to initiate any kind of attack against Hungary. [passage omitted] However, I feel that this region, Hungary included, is in a security policy vacuum.

I fully understand NATO, that it did not want to take on this unstable region by offering NATO membership. Even if the Russian behavior, or the Russian issue does not mean a veto factor for them [NATO], they had to consider whether the region was a destabilizing factor for the world or for Russia.

I would argue with Mr. Woerner on one point: I do not believe that if a new situation develops, any sort of consultation with NATO will help us.

There is something else which is more important for me: The important thing is how can we come to an agreement with the neighbors and what sort of policies shall we follow in connection with Russia and other countries of the region. This will be the key question concerning our security. The other is our relation with the European Union. [passage omitted]

[Szajer] [passage omitted] I think that the main principle of Hungarian foreign policy must be to ensure the conditions for Hungary to complete the integration strategies. The real token of this is full NATO and European Union membership. I think that there are no other priorities. [passage omitted]

[Moderator] What is our hope, until perhaps NATO accepts Hungary as a member?

[Kodolanyi] [We can trust] in the fact that Hungary is a stable country at present and no neighboring army threatens us. [passage omitted]

[Horn] I cannot agree with the idea formulated by Jozsef Szajer that our only savior—either from an economic or from security aspect—is NATO membership. Because Brussels and Prague made one thing clear, and that is that a very long period has to pass before NATO will accept us. I understand this NATO position. But what should we do now? Will our security be doubtful until then? No. I see this: that the Partnership for Peace program is progress of a kind. [passage omitted]

I do not narrow the question of our security down to our neighbors. However, I consider it a fundamental issue. All external attacks throughout history came from there. We have no say in the formation of parliaments and governments in the neighboring countries and God forbid that Hungarian foreign policy would become involved in this. This is the internal affair of the people living there.

We have to cooperate with the people who are elected and considered legitimate in the respective countries, like it or not. I do not like quite a few members of the Romanian leadership, but I do not elect them. We must take the initiative in order that reconciliation should come about.

We must strive for reconciliation and must not keep harping on about our historical grievances. Step by step, we have to establish the trust which is lacking. For this is the situation today. And the West will also be a partner to us in this. The West will be no partner of ours if we clash with each other and increase tension among ourselves.

[Jeszenszky] I entirely agree with [Hungarian Socialist Party] Chairman Horn that we have to strive for good relations with our neighbors, this is obvious. This is also included in the program of the Hungarian Government.

Anybody who followed the events of the past three and half years, can see that Hungary made several initiatives which were sometimes answered, sometimes not. My latest visit in Belgrade also indicates that Hungary always took steps even in situations laden with new conflicts. It is out of the question that Hungary would be responsible for these [present] relations. [passage omitted]

I can most categorically state that the Hungarian Government and other responsible factors—I include the opposition, too—did everything possible recently to bring about a compromise with our neighbors. So this compromise is not up to us. [passage omitted]

[Szajer] In reaction to what Mr. Horn said, I did not mean that NATO membership is the only guarantee for our stability. I also agree that approaching the European Union is the primary political goal of the country. [passage omitted] However, it could happen easily that we miss the boat, for signs already indicate that the West is taking more and more notice of Russia's opinion. [passage omitted]

So we have to draw the conclusions from this and we have to relate to the situation in a pragmatic and realistic way, but at the same time, every opportunity must be utilized.

[Moderator] But what will happen if the negative alternative comes about, that is, if Zhirinovskiy or the likes of him come to power in Russia? Since Mr. Kodolanyi has already referred to the possibility of having a common border with Russia again in the future. Are we prepared for this negative scenario?

[Horn] I do not see the situation as being so dramatic. However, I consider the Zhirinovskiy phenomenon to be a big challenge and one must react to the situation by all means, because unfortunately, this phenomenon can find followers easily in other eastern-central European countries, too. However, the danger of this does not exist for the time being.

As regards the issue of our neighbors, we should survey the past four years as a whole and there were manifestations during this period which did not do much good for our relations with our neighbors. However, let us leave this and look ahead. [passage omitted]

It is not disputed by anybody that our wish to join NATO must be [officially] maintained. However, I have to add that when touring the country I found that people do not seem to think the same way about this. On the contrary, many people question the wisdom of joining NATO after having gotten rid of the Warsaw Pact. [passage omitted] This is why our party proposes to hold a referendum on the matter in order to form a true national consensus.

For the West, the Soviet factor in the past, and now the Russian factor, has always enjoyed absolute priority. They have always approached their former allies—today the central-eastern European states—via the Soviet factor and Moscow. This will prevail all along as long as Russia remains a superpower and, chiefly, a main nuclear power. Unfortunately, this is the reality. And no matter how much we wriggle, we cannot avoid facing this. [passage omitted]

[Jeszenszky] I do not want to boast, but Hungary—and perhaps Poland—played a very significant role in devising the Partnership for Peace program. When it was announced the first time, back in October, it was rather a lean offer. It was expanded a lot since then, and it was the Americans themselves who acknowledged at the Prague meeting that this was already something different from what it had been at the start. [passage omitted]

The issue, where there is rather a sharp conflict between the HSP and other parties, is the issue of the referendum. I do not consider the method of referendum a good one, especially not before an election. I said a few days ago here on the radio that the MDF is in favor of NATO membership, but I did not say that everybody who wants NATO membership has to vote for the MDF. What I say is that if you vote for the MDF, or Fidesz [Federation of Young Democrats] for that matter, you vote for NATO membership at the same time. [passage omitted]

I think that we can spare the country from an unnecessary and costly referendum if all parties state their position clearly in their election manifesto. [passage omitted]

[Horn] As for the question of Partnership [for Peace], I would be cautious with the adjectives. I say that it is a clever invention which is rooted in reality and I can only support it, not that this matters much. On the one hand, it maintains the opportunity of cooperation but on the other hand, it does not oblige NATO to anything which would be impossible for NATO. [passage omitted]

And just to remind everybody, to clear any misunderstanding, Hungary was not liberated by NATO. True, Western help was necessary, but in Hungary, a conscious process, directed from above, took place in the interest of changing the regime, in cooperation with the opposition at the time. I think you can all agree with this.

As for the other issue, whether or not the Warsaw Pact or Moscow considered us as cannon fodder, I would be a bit cautious with this, I did not feel it that way. It was true that they wanted to create a buffer zone and this is how they looked on the central-eastern European states.

I have to say that we weirdly encounter the same today in quite a few Western manifestations, when their policies in connection with Russia are discussed; we are a kind of buffer zone here. Let us not kid ourselves. [passage omitted]

It is no use telling NATO or Mr. Woerner to handle us separately [from the other eastern-central European countries]. It became fully clear after the summit [in Prague] that these countries are handled together—you

can keep on saying the same in the next few years, it is totally unrealistic. [passage omitted]

What is most important for us in these matters is that reality has to be taken into account to the greatest extent. It is not a bad thing for foreign policy to be adapted to reality and to be flexible, [while at the same time] preserving its essence. [passage omitted]

President Announces 8 May Parliamentary Elections

LD0402094694 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 0800 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] Here at home, the first round of the parliamentary elections will be held on Sunday, 8 May, Arpad Goncz, president of the Republic, announced in the parliament.

The president said he had made this decision so that a new and stable government could be formed as soon as possible. On the other hand, the elections should be as cheap as possible, with as many people attending as possible. He also said he had to take several other aspects into consideration; for example, that the day of elections should not clash with the graduation ceremonies in secondary schools and that it should not be a working day. In his speech, the president called the cleanness of the elections important because, as he said, the second ballot was perhaps even more important than the first one in a new democracy.

SZDSZ Chairman Views Relationship With Fidesz

AU0302204994 Budapest BESZELO in Hungarian 3 Feb 94 pp 8,9

[Interview with Ivan Peto, chairman of the Alliance of Free Democrats, by Gabor F. Havas and Ferenc Koszeg; place and date not given: "If the Liberal Parties Together...."]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [BESZELO] In your speech [at the national meeting of deputies, 28-31 January] you said that the Alliance of Free Democrats [SZDSZ] is a true people's party. At the former meeting of deputies, you used the term social-liberal people's party. Contrary to this, our political opponents, including the prime minister himself, has often said that the SZDSZ is a civic radical, rather than a liberal, party. Does this kind of distinction mean anything and does it have anything to say for us?

[Peto] Today these terms are not unequivocal in Hungary. If I call the SZDSZ a people's party, this in itself does not clearly define the SZDSZ for others. However, it can be used as a self-definition. The SZDSZ can be called a people's party in the sense that it has become a lasting institution of Hungarian society, and no one any longer assumes that it will play an insignificant role in the elections. For the SZDSZ to achieve similar results to those in the 1990 elections, the support of the intelligentsia who follow otherwise attractive turn-of-the-century civic radical traditions is not enough—just as it would not have been enough in 1990, either. Today, it is possible to find many people in all strata of Hungarian society who are receptive to the political efforts—which by no means can be called civic radical—represented by the SZDSZ. The SZDSZ's supporters and members are represented in all strata of society, and the reason they vote for us can also be grasped to a certain extent. It might be easier to put this into words in negative statements. They vote for us because they seek a kind of party for themselves that is not like the current government parties, not like the current Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP], and not like the current Federation of Young Democrats [Fidesz]. However, it is also possible to explain the differences because the SZDSZ's image has been established fairly firmly over the past five years. It is a party of modernization that does not delve much into history or ideology, and does not formulate Christian-national or other similar goals that can be seen as ideological goals. It professes to be liberal, but at the same time, the difference from, for example, the Fidesz can be perceived, and this is when we say we are social-liberal. [passage omitted]

[BESZELO] What kind of cooperation would you consider desirable between the liberal parties, especially the two "big" ones, namely the SZDSZ and the Fidesz?

[Peto] It would be desirable for these two parties if, rather than eyeing each other distrustfully, their cooperation was determined by common interests. If I accept that these are two clearly distinct parties, not only in age but now also in their principles, it would be good if they represented their own principles until the first round in the elections and put their own candidates in the best possible positions, while in the second round, in accordance with the principles laid down in the SZDSZ-Fidesz agreement, candidates would be mutually withdrawn, and we would try to determine the character of the next government through forming a small coalition.

This would be the optimal situation but I would not like to appear unaware of the obstacles. In spite of the agreement, the Fidesz is putting much energy into differentiating itself from the SZDSZ by strengthening its own identity, even in cases when cooperation would be better. There is no point in denying that the Fidesz's goal is to become a bigger liberal party than the SZDSZ, and it is putting an awful lot of energy into this. It is also obvious that the Fidesz would be happier to form a coalition with the current government coalition than with the MSZP. However, in the SZDSZ's view, one is worse than the other, and, therefore, it does not yet want to decide on this issue. Finally, it would be no use denying that there is a fair amount of mutual mistrust. I do not know what the Fidesz actually thinks and what it is just saying or doing for tactical reasons; however, its behavior is determined by the unfounded assumption that the SZDSZ has intimate relations with the MSZP. On the other hand, the SZDSZ is suspicious because there are many signs that the Fidesz has particular links

with the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF] and the government. [passage omitted]

[BESZELO] Actually, it would be of vital interest to the Fidesz to try to reduce the mistrust because it is obvious that the liberal line could really determine the next government if a liberal small coalition were formed before the actual government were.

[Peto] This is true but it is not always the practical solutions that happen. For a long time—here there is no change—the Fidesz has been forming its relations with the SZDSZ from viewpoints of rivalry, rather than general political principles. In certain cases in the past, we could have achieved much more if the Fidesz, rather than seeing the assertion of its self-identity as the main task, had looked at the issue itself on which we could have worked together. However, we have to accept the Fidesz as it is. It would be bad politics to impose our own norms on them. If the Fidesz thinks that it can only work in a coalition where the MDF is on one side, perhaps the SZDSZ on the other, and the Fidesz in the middle, this indicates what they might do. If, in addition to this, they did not consult the MDF before making this decision, the MDF could all of a sudden upset the whole thing by saying that it cannot imagine a coalition with the SZDSZ; if in the meantime, the Fidesz could not afford to be angry with the MDF so became angry with the SZDSZ even for this, well, this would be bad luck, but what could one do? The two big liberal parties with the Agrarian Federation and the Entrepreneurs' Party can only jointly be sure of becoming inevitable parts of the government. Whatever kind of coalition is formed, if only one liberal party is part of it, then its importance will be much less than its numerical proportion. However, the liberal parties together could be a determining force in any coalition.

Pawlak's Speech on Signing 'Partnership'

WS0302164594 Warsaw BIURO PRASOWE RZADU INFORMACJA in Polish 0900 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text of speech by Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak in Brussels on 2 February]

[Text] My visit to the NATO Headquarters is taking place at a particularly important time. Today, I will sign on behalf of Poland a framework document pertaining to "Partnership for Peace." To say that we are shaping the future prospects of our continent's secure development is not an overstatement. A few weeks ago we witnessed a NATO summit which took place here, in Brussels. We awaited that event with no less interest than the member countries themselves. We have spoken out on many occasions to present our problems and our concerns, to share with others our vision of European security and our expectations with regard to the NATO partners. We have faith that the decisions reached at the NATO summit create a chance and a hope for a better future and security in Europe. Security must be thought of as a process of eliminating divisions and tensions, and developing cooperation and partnership.

We recognize NATO's special role in contemporary Europe. At the same time we understand that European security cannot be regarded as the exclusive responsibility of NATO. Decisions made by NATO countries will be successful only if they are appropriately responded to throughout Europe. I want to assure you that Poland is ready for comprehensive and serious cooperation.

We were happy to take note of the fact that NATO has confirmed a relationship which exists between the security of its member states and the security of Central and East Europe. In my view, that confirmation not only contributes to a strengthening of the external security of the countries of the region, but it also has a role to play in terms of success of the radical internal reforms being implemented by those very countries.

Our intentions with regard to NATO are clear and widely known. Even though the most recent NATO summit in Brussels did not fulfill all of our expectations, we were happy to take note of NATO's declaration of openness to development of cooperation with the partner countries. We were also happy to take note of the prospect created at the summit of a future widening of NATO to include new members.

Poland accepted "Partnership for Peace" and intends to actively participate in the program. We perceive "Partnership for Peace" to be a new and promising element of the process of building European security. We also regard the initiative as Poland's chance for strengthening its links to NATO, for better cooperation with the Alliance. We also perceive the initiative as a chance for the future implementation of our strategic goal of Poland's integration with Western security structures.

We see the implementation of "Partnership for Peace" not only as a way of getting closer to NATO. We also want to avail ourselves of the opportunities that the program creates for maintaining good, partnershiplike cooperation also with our eastern neighbors. Maintaining such a mutually beneficial cooperation with the countries of our region, a cooperation which would be based on equal rights, remains a crucial issue for Poland.

"Partnership for Peace" has a chance of becoming a wide area of concrete, day-to-day cooperation among European countries for the sake of common security.

Taking into account a certain skepticism which has emerged in the public opinion on this issue, it is important to go beyond mere political declarations and to provide the program with a clear content and complete credibility.

"Partnership for Peace" is a factor which has the potential to positively shape security relations. But while thinking about the future, one should reach beyond mere security. Security, broadly speaking, also means successful economic, cultural, and social development.

Those same goals were also the guiding ideas for the authors of the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949. It is worth recalling that under Article 2 of the Treaty, the parties to the Treaty took upon themselves an obligation to "contribute to the further development of peaceful and friendly relations" among others "through supporting the conditions of stability and prosperity." The parties also obliged themselves not only to eliminate conflicts occurring in their economic relations, but also to "support economic cooperation between every one of them and among all of them." So, while implementing "Partnership for Peace" in the area of political and military cooperation, we should also strive to create a "Partnership for Development," which would be a multiaspect, broad kind of cooperation among America, West, Central, and East Europe. It would be a cooperation among different structures and governmental and extragovernmental institutions, taking into account both regional and local cooperation.

That cooperation should in particular cover those countries which are on their way to a market economy. The cooperation should contribute to increasing the countries' growth rate, to an increased sense of stability, to promoting economic transformations, and to a widening and a strengthening of the market economy in the entire area covered by the partnership concept.

These forms of a broad, open cooperation may significantly contribute to the final elimination of the existing divisions, to Europe's integration, and, as a consequence, to securing stability and prosperity, and to eliminating many sources of current and potential conflicts.

I have faith that together, we will achieve these goals.

Pawlak Discontented About 'Partnership'

BR0302150594 Antwerp GAZET VAN ANTWERPEN in Dutch 3 Feb 94 p 5

[Unattributed article: "Poland Signs Up for Partnership With Little Enthusiasm; Warsaw Expects More From NATO and the European Union"]

[Excerpts] Yesterday, one week after Romania and Lithuania had done so, Poland became the third country to sign up for the Partnership for Peace, which is intended to involve the countries of Central and East Europe in NATO via practical military cooperation. [passage omitted]

However, unlike Lithuanian President Brazauskas and Romanian Foreign Minister Melescanu, Polish Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak openly stated that Poland is not really happy with the partnership. "We can accept it if we are certain that Poland will ultimately be able to become a full member," said Pawlak.

On this issue, the prime minister sees eye to eye with Polish President Lech Walesa, who only went along with the NATO proposal after being subjected to heavy U.S. pressure but subsequently let it be known that, in his view, it can in no way be said to meet Polish demands. Poland, probably to a greater extent than its neighbors, fears a resurgence of Russian imperialism that would threaten its borders. Poland had counted on receiving adequate protection against any threat from the East in the form of security guarantees from NATO. However, a badly disillusioned Warsaw is now having to face up to the fact that NATO is not prepared to give these guarantees. [passage omitted]

Consequently, Warsaw has no option but to take the long road to accession, and the only one leading in that direction is the Partnership for Peace. NATO has already let it be known that Poland and the other Visegrad countries (the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Slovakia) could find themselves placed on a faster track, enabling them to gain full membership before the Romanians or the Bulgarians. However, no one is daring to say so openly so as not to create new dividing lines in Europe. [passage omitted]

Pawlak, EU Discuss 'Partnership,' Integration

WS0402125994 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 4 Feb 94 pp 1, 23

[Article by Maria Wagrowska from Brussels: "Prime Minister Pawlak's Talks With '12'; One Day Everything Will Be Possible"—last paragraph attributed to Katarzyna Szymanska-Borginon]

[Excerpt] "Integration with the European Union [EU] is our strategic goal. The treaty of association—a chance to put an end to the artificial division of Europe"—this was stressed by Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak during his talks with the "12" on the last day of his visit to Brussels. In his talks with EC Chairman Jacques Delors and members of the Commission, the prime minister appealed for both greater opening of markets to Polish goods and for a greater influx of investments.

The prime minister stated that "Poland expects the '12' to propose a schedule of joint work on inroads to membership and to establish the date for a conference which would review our mutual relations."

Delors avoided answering a question concerning the timetable. At a press conference, the EC chairman merely recalled that the "12" had made a political commitment to admit new countries; however, it will do this only when it is possible.

The prime minister also indirectly criticized the West publicly for its trade policy toward Poland. In a paper delivered before Polish and Western dignitaries, invited to Brussels by the Washington Center of Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Prime Minister Pawlak declared that Poland is threatened by, among other things, the maintenance of barriers in the economic and civil development.

"Our efforts to take part in Western structures are supposed to serve the purpose of European cooperation and extending the zone of stability, and, as a consequence, the purpose of strengthening the entire continent," he said.

The "Partnership for Peace" initiative was referred to by the prime minister as "a first step" toward improving our security. According to him, Poland and NATO should begin cooperation in such areas as making systems of communications and logistics uniform, because without any great financial investments they could contribute to the adjustment of our Armed Forces to Western standards. At a breakfast with members of the press, when asked about the attitude of Moscow toward Polish efforts to become a NATO member, the prime minister said that Russia's reservations show that the time when some states meddled with the affairs of others is not yet over. German Defense Minister Volker Ruehe, who was present at the CSIS conference, saw "Partnership for Peace" as a preparatory step for Polish membership in NATO.

He stressed that "stabilization in the Euro-Atlantic region is possible only with Russia, but the security zone cannot be limited from outside by any state." "Germany does not want its eastern border to be a line of division between the area of stability and the area of instability. Poland is entitled to membership in Europe and to the protection of its democratic development," said Ruehe.

Waldemar Pawlak, in talks with EU General Secretary Willem van Eekelen, tried to convince him that the organization's council, jointly with the Central European states, should negotiate the draft of the status of their association with the Western European Union [WEU]. Pawlak emphasized that "we are interested in obtaining the association status we already have with the EU."

Eekelen gave assurances that the status of such states as Poland is being discussed in the WEU. [passage omitted]

Talks on Treaty With Lithuania Nearing Completion

WS0402114694 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 4 Feb 94 p 1

[Article by Maja Narbutt from Vilnius: "Poland-Lithuania: Fifth and Last Round"]

[Text] The next round of Polish-Lithuanian negotiations on the state treaty will be held in three weeks. Lech Walesa's special envoy, who on Thursday [3 February] spoke in Vilnius with [Lithuanian President] Algirdas Brazauskas for the second time, said optimistically that it will be "the fifth, and probably last round."

Andrzej Zakrzewski, secretary of state in the President's Office, suggests that the controversial issues which kept delaying negotiations on the treaty have in fact already been resolved.

The bone of contention was first of all the evaluation of historical events, especially the so-called Zeligowski mutiny and its consequences. For over a year, the Lithuanians firmly rejected Polish suggestions that the evaluation of the past should be left to historians. On Thursday in Vilnius, it was established that part of this declaration pertaining to the evaluation of the past would constitute the treaty's preamble. Different parts of it will be included in the speeches of the Polish and Lithuanian presidents, who will deliver them when the treaty is signed. However, Andrzej Zakrzewski added that "this is what will probably happen." The final decisions will be made during the fifth round of negotiations, held in Warsaw. His statement suggests that the Polish side decided that the formulations proposed on 3 February in Vilnius, concerning the evaluation of the past, are acceptable.

Pawlak, Kwasniewski Discuss 'Conflict'

WS0402114494 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 4 Feb 94 p 1

[Article by E.K. and M.W.: "Evening Talks Between Pawlak and Kwasniewski; Behind Closed Doors"]

[Text] On Thursday [3 February] evening, in the Office of the Council of Ministers [URM] there was a meeting between Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak and Aleksander Kwasniewski, leader of the Democratic Left Alliance [SLD].

Pawlak and Kwasniewski were driven to the URM through a side entrance; after the meeting, they drove off without talking with journalists waiting outside the building. The subject of the talk was the recall of Finance Deputy Minister Stefan Kawalec, as well as methods of governing and joint governing within the coalition. Kwasniewski held over three hours of talks with SLD ministers before the meeting. At that time, Deputy Prime Minister Borowski suggested that the powers of each of the three deputy prime ministers be clearly defined, so that each of them understood their responsibilities.

On the same day, on the plane from Brussels to Warsaw, Waldemar Pawlak told journalists accompanying him that internal relations between the coalition parties are much more quiet than it might seem when one views them from the outside. The coalition agreement signed by the Polish Peasant Party and SLD does not regulate all relations between the governing parties, and even though there are no major frictions between them, their stands on many issues are different. This is why the situation requires patience and dialogue, which will make it possible to find good solutions.

During the meeting of the prime minister and SLD leader in Brussels, Aleksander Kwasniewski is said to have expressed his dissatisfaction over the existing conflict. Journalists who witnessed this had the impression that Kwasniewski was voicing his opinions very firmly—but not so firmly as to let the crisis rock the government coalition. After the Thursday evening talks between both politicians, journalists came to the simple conclusion that their faces were rather glum. Both politicians are supposed to issue information on the results of their talks at a press conference on Friday.

Pawlak, Borowski, Kwasniewski Hold Talks

LD0402104494 Warsaw Third Program Radio Network in Polish 0900 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak, Deputy Prime Minister Marek Borowski, and Aleksander Kwasniewski, leader of the Social Democracy of the Polish Republic last night discussed reaching a new coalition agreement. We were told this by today's guest, Aleksander Kwasniewski. Later today the leaders of the Polish Peasant Party and the Democratic Left Alliance will meet.

[Begin recording] [Kwasniewski] I am trying to convince both Marek Borowski and the prime minister about the hierarchy of issues. The most important issue for today is the budget; the most important issue is an effective government; personal matters are somewhere behind. I am convinced that if such principles are accepted by the prime minister then Marek Borowski will not submit his resignation—he is a responsible politician....

[Unidentified correspondent, interrupts] But did he say yesterday that he was withdrawing his resignation?

[Kwasniewski] The resignation has not been submitted...

[Correspondent, interrupting] It was submitted last Friday.

[Kwasniewski] No, it was not submitted; it was just announced...

[Correspondent, interrupting] Then did he withdraw his announcement?

[Kwasniewski] Yes, if these principles are accepted then I think that the whole issue will be settled positively. [end recording]

Kwasniewski added that he expects Prime minister Waldemar Pawlak's reply on the question of possible nominations for deputy ministers of defense, foreign affairs and internal affairs from among the coalition members. The prime minister will also explain the role of Jerzy Milewski, deputy defense minister and the head of the National Security Office, in the government.

SLD Leader Stresses Coalition Not Threatened

LD0402104094 Warsaw Radio Warszawa Network in Polish 0900 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] Aleksander Kwasniewski, leader of the Democratic Left Alliance [SLD] has given an assurance that the existence of the government coalition is not threatened at present. In a statement for the Signals of the Day, the early morning slot of the Polish Radio first program, Aleksander Kwasniewski said that there was no possibility at present to replace the coalition of the PSL [Polish Peasant Party] and the SLD with any other political alliance.

Kwasniewski said that his talks yesterday with Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak focused, among other things, on making the government activities more effective. Talks on the issue are to continue today, and, according to Aleksander Kwasniewski, they are going in the right direction.

In Kwasniewski's view, Minister of Finance Marek Borowski will certainly not resign.

SdRP Leader on NATO, European Union, Russia

BR0302132194 Brussels LA LIBRE BELGIQUE in French 3 Feb 94 p 4

[Interview with Aleksander Kwasniewski, leader of Social Democracy of the Polish Republic, by Christophe Lamfalussy in Brussels on 2 February: "The Strongman of Warsaw: Attitudes Must Change"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] Aleksander Kwasniewski, 39, is the new strongman of Warsaw. He is leader of Social Democracy of the Polish Republic [SdRP], which won September's elections and marked the return of the former communist left in Poland. [passage omitted]

LA LIBRE BELGIQUE met Mr. Kwasniewski on Wednesday morning and asked him what he thought of the partnership offered by NATO.

[Kwasniewski] It is obviously in Poland's interests to be a full-fledged member of an effective European security structure. NATO is the only real structure. We understand that the integration process takes time. But that is not enough for us. I do not want, as Chancellor Kohl said in Davos, a border between the two Europes running between Germany and Poland. We must do two things. On the one hand, integrate our economies, make them more open because, without this, a new economic wall will be created between the two Europes. Also, we must change the thinking behind European security. Before, it was one of opposition—opposition to Russia, opposition to the Warsaw Pact, and, on the other side, opposition to NATO. And this change in attitudes must take account of Russia.

[Lamfalussy] Of Russia?

[Kwasniewski] Yes, because Russian politicians believe that a NATO strengthened by Poland and other Central European countries will oppose Russia. What is happening in Russia is not a resurgence of geographically limited nationalism. It is the feeling that the great Russia has lost land. Russia and Ukraine must therefore participate.

[Lamfalussy] What form of participation?

[Kwasniewski] That is up to the Russians to say. It is impossible to totally integrate Russia, which is bigger than Western Europe.

[Lamfalussy] Do we need a European Army that can intervene in domestic conflicts, such as in the former Yugoslavia?

[Kwasniewski] Rather than a large army, it would be useful to develop cooperation instruments between well-prepared troops, which would be able to help resolve such local conflicts.

[Lamfalussy] The association accord between Poland and the European Union entered into force on Tuesday [1 Feb]. How can this help the Polish economy?

[Kwasniewski] For the past two years, we have had a trade deficit with the EEC: We import more than we export. Protectionist barriers exist, principally for our agriculture and the steel industry. We hope that this accord is going to help us to export more. It is also important to give Poland the prospect of membership. It would be good to be members of the European Union by the year 2000.

[Lamfalussy) Which countries are the major foreign investors in Poland?

[Kwasniewski] The United States is the most active. The Netherlands, Italy, and Austria follow. Paradoxically, Germany ranks no higher than fifth, probably because it has been so busy with the rehabilitation of the former GDR.

Poll Author Apologizes for Error in Data

WS0302130894 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 3 Feb 94 p 1

[Apology by Renata Wrobel: "January Results of Public Opinion Research Institute for RZECZPOSPOLITA; Correction: Coalition Loses Support"]

[Text] In my discussion yesterday of the results of an opinion poll conducted at the request of our daily by the Sopot Public Opinion Research Institute [PBS], I made an error. I mixed the table of November survey results with the table of results from research conducted in January, as a result of which most of the conclusions I drew are wrong. In today's paper we will present the correct data.

I would like to apologize to the readers and PBS for misleading them.

Correction of Error

WS0302143394 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 3 Feb 94 p 2

[Article by D.P.: "January Results of Public Opinion Research Institute for RZECZPOSPOLITA; Correction: Coalition Loses Support"]

[Text] In reality, the poll [conducted for RZECZPOSPOLITA by the Sopot Public Opinion Research Institute] showed a noticeable drop, not a slight increase, in the popular rating of the Democratic Left Alliance [SLD], as well as a declining trend in sympathies for the Polish Peasant Party [PSL].

Growing is support for the Democratic Union [UD], which is the strongest opposition party; support for its closest ally, the Liberal-Democratic Congress [KLD], is on the wane. There would be seven parties in parliament: all of the present parliamentary parties plus the KLD.

The SLD has lost a lot of support where it felt strong in November: among the employees of state enterprises, unskilled workers, as well as inhabitants of small and medium-sized towns. Support for the SLD especially dropped among people who have the best educations and the highest incomes. Also people employed in private companies back the party of Aleksander Kwasniewski much less frequently than they did before. The SLD is still supported by the poorest people, as well as by the unemployed, who back this party more often than any other.

Over the past two months, the PSL has discouraged many older voters—60 years old and older. It is still the second-most-popular grouping in this milieu (the most popular is the now nonexistent election coalition "Fatherland," comprising such parties as the Christian-National Union and the Party of Christian Democrats). However, support for this party among 60-year-old respondents is no higher than in the other groups. The PSL is still the favorite party of peasants and agricultural employees; almost 60 percent of respondents in these groups would vote for it today.

Election Preferences (in percent)

	Nov 93	Dec 93	Jan 94
SLD	25	24	19
PSL	20	19	118
UD	16	14	14
Union of Labor	9	9	9
Confederation for an Independent Poland	5	5	8
KLD	7	6	5
Nonparty Bloc in Support of Reforms	3	4	5

Right-Wing Coalition Accepts National Party

LD0302170294 Warsaw TV Polonia Network in Polish 1600 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] The coalition of the Union for Real Politics, the Conservative Party, the Christian Peasant Party, and the Party of Christian Democrats has decided to accept into the coalition the National Party [Stronnictwo Narodowe], whose leader is Jan Zamoyski. Soon there will be an official signing of documents in this matter.

Sejm Commission Unyielding on Milewski Appointments

LD0302221694 Warsaw PAP in Polish 1728 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Warsaw, 3 Feb (PAP)—The Sejm National Defense Commission has not changed its stand and continues to be against the linking of posts in the Ministry of National Defense and in the National Security Bureau by Minister Milewski. It is also disturbed at the changes being carried out in the Ministry of Defense, weakening civilian control over the military. This was reported by Tomasz Nalecz, deputy chairman of the National Defense Commission, after the Thursday meeting of its Presidium.

On 16 December last year, in a recommendation to the prime minister, the commission queried the linking of posts in the Ministry of Defense, the National Security Bureau, and the Presidential Chancellery. In the view of deputies, this "strikes at the constitutional principle of the division of the supreme state authorities and also creates confusion as to prerogatives." The deputies are still waiting for the prime minister's reply.

According to the Defense Ministry, the linking of posts by Milewski is in accordance with the law.

In the view of the commission, the announced reorganization in the Defense Ministry is leading to the weakening of civilian control over the army. "Deputies [in the commission] found out about these changes from the press, despite the fact that Minister Milewski promised the commission that he would not have any secrets from them," Nalecz said. He added that he is "also surprised by the tone of hostility toward parliament in certain statements by representatives of the Ministry of Defense."

The changes in the Defense Ministry are based on the reorganization of the ministry's management structures and also of the departments answerable to the secretary of state in the Ministry of Defense, Milewski. The plans envision that two deputy ministers posts will remain and the linking of two civil-military hierarchies, those for welfare matters and for defense policy.

Commission Restores Property to Church

AU0302182294 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 2 Feb 94 p 3

[Article by Cezary Gmyz: "The Church Is Regaining Its Property"]

[Text] Of the 180,000 hectares of farmland nationalized from 1945 onwards, the church has so far regained 16,000. The Property Commission dealing with this issue has already initiated proceedings concerning half the compensation claims filed by church authorities.

The return of church property is taking place according to the provisions of the law "on the relationship of the state with the Catholic Church."

The Property Commission has so far received 2,985 applications for the return of church property. Although the deadline for the receipt of such applications expired on 31 December 1992, fresh applications are still being received by the Commission, but they will not be considered.

By the end of 1993, the Commission had initiated proceedings on 1,560 claims, over 50 percent of the total received. Some 684 claims have been settled, 573 of them in favor of the church, in other words in favor of a parish, diocese, monastery, or church foundation. But the size of the property regained by the church is often less than the amount claimed by it.

Until now, the church authorities have regained 16,000 hectares of farmland and forest land. After the war, the church lost about 130,000 hectares of land out of the 180,000 it held at the time, and that does not include prewar territory east of the Bug River, nor parts of Poland that formerly belonged to Germany. Of its so-called built-up property, the church has regained slightly less than 200 hectares, the largest of which are the monastery in Henrykow and the church estate in Frombork.

Even though the law allows the payment of compensation for lost land out of the state treasury, not once has the Property Commission applied this solution. That does not mean that the church has not received any money. In some cases, instead of the actual property, church authorities received a financial settlement from a local government body or other corporate user of the property in question. Such settlements total 2 billion zlotys so far.

Some 111 church claims for compensation have been rejected or postponed, mainly in cases where the return of church property would have been in breach with the law.

Boguslaw Skreta and Dr. Jan Chmiel of the Property Commission have assured me that in reaching a decision the Commission takes care that neither the interests of the church nor those of the state are jeopardized.

The Property Commission was set up in 1989. It consists of 12 members, six on the government side and six on the church side. Four members constitute the so-called adjudicating body, which decides on the outcome of a case by means of a vote. The Commission's meetings take the form of a court hearing, at which each side presents documentary evidence and employs legal arguments. The Commission tries to reach an amicable settlement. It may restore the original property to the church, or it can offer the church an alternative property. There is no appeal against the Commission's rulings.

Strikes Continue in Western Coal Mines

WS0302142694 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 3 Feb 94 p 2

[Article by B.C.: "In Slask, Occupations, Blockades, Strikes"]

[Text] *The headquarters of the Jastrzebie Coal Partnership [Jastrzebska Spolka Weglowa] has been occupied by trade union activists for nine days now. Following yesterday's two-hour warning strike in the partnership's six mines, a Protest Committee sponsored by "Solidarity," "Solidarity 80," and "Kontra" is sticking to its demands for a 15-percent salary increase.*

On the other hand, management says that the partnership cannot afford such an increase when you take into account, for instance, the fact that its financial obligations exceed claims it is entitled to by 2.2 trillion zlotys. To prove the argument is true, the management ordered that an expert economic analysis be conducted by the end of the week. The partnership's president proposes that in the meantime, both sides come up with mediators to provide assistance in salary negotiations which started at the beginning of the month. The Protest Committee informed the partnership's management that, if the talks fail, the committee will avail itself of Article 15 of the Trade Union Law—that would mean initiating a continuous strike.

The headquarters of the Gliwice Coal Partnership [Gliwicka Spolka Weglowa] is also under occupation now, but this time it is by several dozen activists from "Solidarity 80." "Solidarity" has been supporting the strike since Tuesday [1 February]. The activists are demanding salary increases without, however, defining the limits of increases; they also demand an increase in the value of coal allowances (8 tons) from 850,000 zlotys to 1.35 million zlotys, which is the market price for coal. But the occupying trade unionists categorically reject one-time payments of 1.8 million zlotys to the partnership's miners. That increase is the result of a recent strike by activists of "August 80," which competes with "Solidarity 80." Talks with the partnership's management are under way.

For its part, "Solidarity" organized two-hour warning strikes in the mines of the Bytom Coal Partnership [Bytomska Spolka Weglowa] on Wednesday. The strikes went on from 0600 to 0700 in six mines; there were strikes until 0800 in two mines, and there were no strikes at all in three other mines. An open demonstration was announced in "Jowisz" mine before the second shift.

About 600 employees of the Bytom Mining Enterprise are on strike. They are occupying the management's building. The strike is sponsored by "Solidarity" and by the Miners Trade Union. The trade unionists are demanding salary increases.

Minister Podkanski Queries GM Contract

WS0302154394 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 3 Feb 94 p 1

[Article by D.W.: "GM: The Contract Is Final"]

[Text] Foreign Economic Cooperation Minister Leslaw Podkanski, who was quoted by TYGODNIK ZAMOJSKI and then by PAP, issued a negative evaluation of the joint-venture agreement between the FSO automobile plant and General Motors.

The head of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Cooperation said that the agreement does not resolve the global issues related to the restructurization of the Polish automobile industry. He stated that the sum of 16 million German marks, which the concern promised to invest in FSO, was "no sum." He also added that he is against granting the company the guaranteed preferential system for sales of Opel Astras. He most probably meant the customs licenses for those cars and the possibility of selling those cars, just like Fiats, to those who made prepayments to receive Fiat 126's or FSO's [system of selling rationed cars under the communist system].

"Our contract has all the necessary signatures," RZECZPOSPOLITA was told by John Passadis, the GM representative in Poland; he added that "the contract is permanent and final. GM representatives have already arrived at FSO and we are getting ready to begin manufacturing." Far more painful for GM Poland was the decision by the Finance Ministry which, as of 1 February, lowered the limit for the 15-percent excise tax on imported cars from 7,000 ECU's to 8,000 ECU's.

FSO General Director Andrzej Tyszkiewicz said that the implementation of the contract is in line with the schedule: The day of "closing" is scheduled for March; the installation of equipment and machines in the factory will begin in April.

Iliescu Gives Interview to Kiev Daily

AU0402120394 Bucharest DIMINEATA SUPPLEMENT in Romanian 29-30 Jan 94 pp 2-4

[Interview with President Ion Iliescu by Larisa Ivshyna, deputy editor in chief of the Russian-language Ukrainian daily KIEVSKIYE VEDOMSTI; place and date not given—"translated from the Russian-language audio recording"]

[Text] [Ivshyna] I believe that the people of Ukraine want their country to be part of a united Europe. As far as we are concerned, it is obvious that this is also one of the characteristic features of Romania's foreign policy. At the same time, the Ukrainians would like to know your opinion on this and also whether your are satisfied with the relations with your neighbors, particularly Ukraine.

[Iliescu] Regarding your first question, I believe this is the common desire of all European countries, which is in accordance with the new trend in the evolution of international relations on our continent. The old state of affairs and the old division of the continent into two parts have been done away with. The old opposing military alliances and political-ideological divisions have been abandoned. I believe that all European countries are now moving toward the establishment of a new climate of general integration of all European countries into a single community. Of course, this does not exclude the existence of good relations with one's neighbors. Therefore, our foreign policy is aimed at developing overall relations with all the European countries, while also improving relations with neighboring countries, primarily Ukraine, since both our countries are going through the same difficult period of changes. I believe it is to our mutual benefit to have good-neighborly relations.

[Ivshyna] The first question was rather diplomatic, while the second one had more to do with the human aspects of relations between people. For instance, when I left Kiev, it was no easy matter to get to Bucharest. I would have liked to have been able to board a plane in Kiev and fly directly to Bucharest. Will that become possible? That would be a good sign in view of the fact that we are, after all, close neighbors. Do you not think that we can move toward closer economic cooperation if we develop our transportation links? Is this a real possibility?

[Iliescu] I believe that we will find ways and means of facilitating these links as well as the human links so that people can communicate more easily with one another. In this way, we will also be able to eliminate the relics and vestiges of the past, when we proclaimed "fraternal relations" between our countries, while extremely tough and forbidding obstacles were being raised to block communications between people. I believe that, with the development of democratic structures in our countries, we will manage to establish new and good links for direct communication.

[Ivshyna] As far as I know, you are already expected in Kiev and we hope that you will meet with our president there. Could you specify when that visit is going to take place?

[Iliescu] I hope that we will be able to pay this visit to Kiev in 1994 and meet with President Kravchuk.

[Ivshyna] Will the visit take place at the beginning of the year?

[Iliescu] This will be established through democratic [as published] channels.

[Ivshyna] I hope we will not have to wait too long.

[Iliescu] No. I believe it will take place in the first half of the year.

[Ivshyna] In this regard, I would like to ask you another question, one which is equally important for us, namely whether work is proceeding on the drafting of a treaty between our countries and whether you expect it to be signed in the near future. If this is not the case, maybe you can tell us if there are any obstacles to its drafting. Or maybe the drafting of the treaty is not so important as its essence.

[Iliescu] Right now, the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs is elaborating a political document—a political statement—to be signed by the two presidents. I believe that we will manage to finish it so that we can meet and sign it in the first half of 1994. This will be a good signal for the overall development of our relations.

Of course, there are various problems between our countries. History has left us a difficult inheritance regarding territories and borders, but we are approaching these issues realistically by taking into consideration the new realities prevailing on the continent and between our countries. In view of these realities, we must find political solutions to all these problems in order to promote a climate of good neighborliness between us.

[Ivshyna] Mr. President, you are known as a man with progressive views in Ukraine. We do not think of you as a revolutionary in politics, but rather as a politician who believes in consensus, something which is good for politics, since the people are tired and want some quiet for a change. They seem to think that, if things proceed at a slower pace, such a process may ensure that confrontations can be avoided. I realize that a politician of your caliber must take into consideration the entire political spectrum. In this respect, it would be very important for our countries to engage in a dialogue of trust so as to dispel the doubts nurtured by some people in Ukraine. I am referring to the problem that might hamper the signing of a treaty between our countries, namely the territorial problem. If I understand correctly, the real issue is the recognition of existing borders.

[Iliescu] The problem raised by you is a complex one. I consider myself a revolutionary but also a politician who is a realist. I was at the center of all the events that

characterized the Romanian revolution that was spontaneous and tougher than all the upheavals that took place in the other countries. This has also led to an abrupt change in the political structures. Romanian society was given a revolutionary jolt but, then, we had to create new structures, foster new relations between people, establish a democratic climate in political and social life, reorganize the economy, and implement economic reforms, something which requires a climate of overall cooperation among all the constructive forces in society. This requires exactly what you have just said, namely an open approach to all problems and an open attitude toward all social categories and all political and social forces. This is what I am striving to achieve in my practical activity and what is important for international relations too. In other words, there is the need to tackle concrete situations in a realistic and unbiased manner, something which can create a good climate for the development of international relations. This is what we are trying to accomplish in our foreign policy.

[Ivshyna] Of course, there are also certain people in Romania who disagree with this and demand a radical solution. What is your attitude toward them?

[Iliescu] We are trying to solve all these problems through dialogue because there are also persons who maintain that the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact was not only antidemocratic but also illegal and that we must reestablish the rights of all states and nations proceeding from the historical realities and on the basis of the legal principles governing relations between states. At the same time, as I have already said, one must take into consideration the prevailing realities because nothing good can come out of any other approach.

[Ivshyna] The approach suggested by the extremists is very dangerous.

[Iliescu] Yes, because it would upset the entire situation in Europe. Such problems exist not only between our countries but practically between all countries. Let us just take Ukraine for example. You have similar problems with the Slovaks, Poles, Russians, and so forth.

[Ivshyna] That would be tantamount to opening a "Pandora's box...."

[Iliescu] Germany also has such problems. I am referring to Koenigsberg that has become Kaliningrad and so forth. If one starts delving into this problem, there is going to be no end in sight. Therefore, I believe that the only realistic approach to the problem is a political one that takes into account existing realities. All efforts should be made to create a good climate for relations between states.

[Ivshyna] You said that you do not speak Russian very well but I see that your Russian is very good.

[Iliescu] I have some difficulties in speaking it.

[Ivshyna] I would like to ask you how you assess the economic situation in Romania. It seems to me that you started from a very low level, under very harsh conditions, and have now advanced to creating the mechanism of a market economy, whereas Ukraine has probably reached the "critical point" regarding its problems right now. Your experience would be very useful to us, particularly since you recently held consultations with the opposition that has expressed its dissatisfaction with the government's activities. How do you assess the current efforts to promote the process of reform?

[Iliescu] There are two aspects to economic life. On the one hand, the difficulties created by the "overthrow" within the country; that is to say, the very rigid and centralized framework and system of economic management of the past was destroyed overnight, at the start of 1990, something which has led to a number of hardships in the development of economic relations within the country. This is one of the aspects. The second one is the collapse of our system of international economic relations particularly with our neighbors—members of the former Council for Mutual Economic Assistance—and the entire space of the former Soviet Union that was our main partner and a very important source of raw and energy materials as well as an important market for the sale of our industrial products. This has been primarily reflected in the fall in industrial production. At this time, our industrial enterprises are operating at half their capacity, something which is obviously creating great social hardships, particularly due to unemployment and inflation.

[Ivshyna] The number of unemployed has reached almost one million in Romania. Is this true?

[Iliescu] Yes. It is about one million.

[Ivshyna] Has it reached the figure of one million? Or maybe even exceeded it?

[Iliescu] Yes, it is maybe more than a million. However, as early as the first half of 1990, we started taking steps to open up our economic system and redress our economic situation by giving impetus to the private sector. At this time, the private sector is playing quite an important role in our economy, with a share of more than 30 percent of the labor force. There are over 400,000 private enterprises: The first ones appeared in the trade network, then they extended to services. Now, there are also several small and medium-sized production enterprises. The aforementioned sector is already playing a very active role in the economy, contributing to a reduction in the level of unemployment that otherwise might have been even higher.

At the same time, we have been implementing economic reform since 1990, proceeding from an early study on the structure of our economy. That study also represented a first attempt to put together a single strategy for economic reform. We set up a group of experts and economists from various fields, including experts in macroeconomy, who elaborated the general outline of this economic reform: The liberalization of all elements of economic relations and the restructuring of the entire

economy, industry, and so forth. It is on this basis that we have taken certain measures in the direction of privatization. The large-scale privatization process is being implemented at a slower pace. We have reorganized industry in its entirety. Some 6,000 industrial enterprises have been reorganized and turned into commercial companies that, in turn, will be transformed into private enterprises on a share-holding basis. However, this process will last a long time due to a shortage of capital for the purchase of those shares. However, in order to facilitate this process, 30 percent of the social capital of these enterprises has been distributed free of charge to all citizens over 18 years of age in the form of value bonds, while the government plans to turn these bonds into shares in 1994. About a third of the 6,000 enterprises will be privatized in 1994. Measures have been taken to liberalize domestic and foreign trade activity as well as prices. This has been a more difficult process; it resulted in the emergence of a number of social problems during the first half of 1993. The entire system of taxes and revenues has been changed with the introduction of value-added-tax that plays a new major role in relations among economic units. This was one of the more radical steps taken in 1993. We also did quite a few things toward laying the foundations of a market economy system, but there is obviously quite a lot still to be done in this respect, hence the new measures envisaged in the government's program. I believe that we will solve some of these problems in 1994 and this will enable us to place our economy on new foundations.

[Ivshyna] What is it that upsets the opposition so much that it is demanding a change of government now?

[Iliescu] The opposition will always find something to be upset about and will always try to change the government. This is obviously the case with all societies. However, this is not the main problem. The most important problem is the people's discontent; this has its own valid reasons that are linked to the outcome of this "involution" of our economy. By that, I mean the decline in production, inflation, and unemployment, which are causing many hardships for the people and lie at the root of all this discontent that the opposition is obviously trying to exploit.

We hope that 1994 will be the year that will see the normalization and revival of our economic activity. We have already had several positive signals in 1993 since we have managed to stop the decline in production; the industrial activity curve is hovering at the "zero level," something which will create the basis of the economic recovery that we are counting on in 1994.

In agriculture, we have also had three very difficult years because of the drought. This year was the first one with good crops. Of course, we were faced here with other hardships too, since the cooperative farm system had been disorganized. That was due to the reaction of the peasants after years of brutal interference by the state in the life of cooperative farms that, actually, were not cooperative at all. Hence the reaction of the peasants against the cooperative farms as such, but this has led to other hardships as well. Nevertheless, certain positive trends have already emerged. The peasants are beginning to associate without coercion in order to carry out agricultural work communally, to use jointly the available agricultural technology and the irrigation system, and so forth. Therefore, we hope that, in 1994 and in the coming years, prospects will be created for our agriculture that will enable us to achieve a normal situation. The agricultural sector should play an active role in our economy.

Likewise, regarding our exports, we have reached a negative foreign trade balance in the past three years, meaning that imports have increased rapidly while exports have decreased. This has had a very negative impact on our economy and has led to the depreciation of the national currency. In the last three months, we have made certain progress in the sphere of exports. We hope that this will give further impetus to exports in 1994, since this is an important prerequisite for our economy.

Consequently, there are certain positive elements that have marked 1993 and we want to develop them further in 1994.

[Ivshyna] Many people recall that, a few years ago, foreigners who came to Romania were not able to see neon advertisements and public lights but only a poor market, with only occasional street lighting. We would like to know how you have managed to do away with this energy crisis, so to speak.

[Iliescu] This issue has both positive and negative aspects. First, the decrease in industrial production has reduced energy consumption in industry. This has created conditions for improving energy and fuel supplies to the population that had to suffer a lot in this respect in the last years of Ceausescu's regime.

[Ivshyna] Did you extract more of your own oil or did you take other measures as well?

[Iliescu] No. Simply, the industry has started to consume less, hence my statement about a positive aspect associated with various negative elements.

[Ivshyna] As far as we are concerned, this problem of energy resources is a painful one in Ukraine. What is the situation in your country? Do you use your own resources or do you resort to imports?

[Iliescu] We are importing crude oil, for instance. Our national production of crude oil is only 6-7 million metric tons per year while we consume some 15 million tons annually. Our refineries have a capacity of 35 million tons. Therefore, we are not even exploiting our refineries to full capacity since we have lost some major suppliers such as the Russian space, Iraq, Libya, and Kuwait and we do not have the necessary financial means to extract more crude oil. Hence, we are limiting ourselves to refining some 15-16 million tons per year.

[Ivshyna] When you talked about the serious changes that have occurred in your country, you obviously referred to not only the changes in the economic structure but also those in the political sphere.

[Iliescu] The biggest progress of all has been made in the political sphere. The economy is registering a slower pace in this respect.

[Ivshyna] I would now like to raise the issue of security, namely how one should fill the "security gap" that has emerged after the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. I am not referring to "bloc" matters but I would nevertheless like to know your opinion on the way in which Romania intends to ensure its security in the future. Do you plan to become an unconditional NATO member or do you have other alternatives? For instance, what is your opinion about our president's initiative on creating a security zone in East Europe?

[Iliescu] Today, the problem of security is more of a political than military nature. It should reflect all the progress made on our continent in view of the new political relations that have been established between all the countries on this continent. Therefore, we have become actively involved in the CSCE process and we believe that this institution is an important political framework for expanding political relations between all CSCE countries.

At the same time, we look toward other international bodies that should radically change their content, such as NATO and the West European Union [WEU], with a view to ensuring that all our countries are included in this framework. We speak out against any discrimination on this matter. There is some talk on whether to include only certain countries in NATO while others are going to be left out. I believe that, if NATO is to become a broader framework for cooperation, then the problem should be broached in the same way for all the countries in our zone. That is why we supported both the initiatives to create a new framework of cooperation with our countries—there is a partnership and cooperation council at NATO and the WEU—and the new U.S. initiative Partnership for Peace that advocates a nondiscriminatory approach to all the countries in our region.

Generally speaking, we also appreciate the initiative of Ukrainian President Kravchuk as a further possibility of cooperation between the countries in Eastern Europe; an initiative that takes into consideration both the West and Russia so as not to create elements of tension among our countries but to create a general climate of understanding among states.

[Ivshyna] It seems to me that you are treating your opposition quite kindly. I would like to know your opinion about the results of the elections in Russia.

[Iliescu] There are two aspects there. On the one hand, you have the general results on the adoption of the Russian Constitution with their positive aspects, since the Constitution creates possibilities for the development of the democratic forces in Russia. We hope that these forces will become stronger as this is important both for Russia and for the overall climate in our region, Europe, and the world over.

At the same time, there are also certain signals that make us wonder: Zhirinovskiy and all those extremist forces as well as those longing for Russian imperialism whose activities pose a real danger for all domestic forces in Russia but also for our countries. However, we hope that the democratic forces will manage to remove this danger.

[Ivshyna] Yes, this worries us too, since we keep being reminded of tragic things regarding a greater Russia and so forth—something which is rather dangerous if we just think of Germany in 1933—at a time when our nations are going through painful changes in the economic and social spheres. Regarding cooperation zones, I would like to ask you another question in connection with the sanctions imposed against Yugoslavia. Since both Romania and Ukraine have had to suffer from the embargo, how do you think that our countries could be compensated for the damage incurred by observing this embargo?

[Iliescu] We pin no great hopes on compensations as such. Of course, we acted and raised this problem with all the relevant bodies, including the Sanctions Committee of the UN Security Council, but we have no great hopes of any real compensation.

There is another thing that is important, namely to search for a radical solution to the Yugoslav problem and to find political solutions to all those problems. This primarily depends on Yugoslavia's internal forces and the newly emerged states that themselves have to find solutions to their own problems, something which would lead to the lifting of the sanctions imposed against the internal forces there, sanctions which cause suffering to all innocent people. We also have to suffer, those who are neighboring on the region. I believe that nobody stands to gain from the continuation of this abnormal situation. We hope that political solutions will be found to these problems by establishing normal relations between our countries.

[Ivshyna] Mr. President, how do you view the fact that all the West's plans for reestablishing peace in former Yugoslavia have borne no results?

[Iliescu] It is very easy to create tension and conflict, but it is very difficult to normalize the situation. I believe that the problem has not always been tackled in a realistic way within Yugoslavia itself, where the internal forces have failed to make the necessary efforts to ensure a normal evolution of the changes that have occurred in Yugoslavia. At the same time, neither have the international bodies treated Yugoslavia's internal problems with adequate understanding and I believe that such an approach has been quite dangerous not only for Yugoslavia but also for the stability of our entire region.

[Ivshyna] Mr. President, I would like you to talk about a specific sphere, namely your government's official policy on the issue of guaranteeing the rights of national minorities. I realize that this humanitarian problem is quite important for both our countries.

[Iliescu] We have tackled this problem from a political point of view. I believe that we have created the constitutional and legal conditions for all national and religious minorities to become freely involved in the development of our society. We have created conditions for them to be represented in the political bodies. All national minorities are represented in our Parliament, not only the Hungarians, who are the largest minority and have the highest percentage of representation, namely 39 representatives in our Parliament. The smaller minorities also have their representatives in Parliament and in local administration. We have also created conditions for them to be able to develop their culture and specific features in all directions. We consider this a political necessity, in view of the conditions prevailing in our country, while being aware of the fact that this problem is being treated differently in other countries. For instance, many Western European countries do not even have the notion of "national minorities," as the minorities are considered citizens of the respective country and members of its national structure. Take France, for example: If a person is a citizen of France, then he is French.

[Ivshyna] This approach has its positive and negative aspects.

[Iliescu] For France, there is no such thing as a "French German," but just a "Frenchman." The Germans in Strasbourg are bound by the status of the citizens of that city, hence they are members of the French nation.

However, we have a different historical tradition and we have always treated this problem in another way. Our Constitution provides the necessary framework for solving the problems of the national minorities. There are two elements to which one should pay great attention. There are certain separatist trends that are concretely expressed in such slogans as "territorial self-determination on the basis of ethnic criteria." This cannot lead to normal relations between people. How can we isolate the Hungarians living in the center of our country, actually in two counties where they represent the majority of the population? You see, there are Romanians and other nationalities living in those counties as well. Such an approach would lead to a dangerous tendency of isolation and separatism. We view as equally dangerous the desire of certain circles to patronize minorities living on the territory of other states. This could lead to tension in relations between states. In our political activity, we attach great importance to monitoring these two trends that we obviously reject.

[Ivshyna] You are distancing yourself from them?

[Iliescu] We are in favor of using the national minorities as a binding element between neighboring states and not as an element of creating tension in relations between our countries.

[Ivshyna] From press reports, I learned of a sad and undesirable incident that occurred during the protest demonstrations recently held in front of the Russian Embassy in Bucharest in connection with the Ilascu trial [trial of a group of Moldovans headed by Ilie Ilascu, official of the Christian Democratic Popular Front of Moldova, sentenced to death by a court in Tiraspol, Dniester region]: Hooligans destroyed the busts of Russian writers, including Shevchenko. I would like to know your reaction to this incident and whether the busts will be restored.

[Iliescu] There can be no doubt at all that we are against such demonstrations organized by some very vociferous groups that are in a minority. From a sentimental viewpoint, I might understand their motivation, but one cannot approve of such deeds.

[Ivshyna] As far as Ukraine is concerned, Shevchenko is not only a monument but also a symbol.

[Iliescu] The same as Eminescu [classic Romanian poet] is for us.

[Ivshyna] I would like you to tell us something about your life outside politics. What else do you do?

[Iliescu] Right now, I have no time for anything else. Politics takes up all my time. As a matter of fact, I have no free time left at all.

[Ivshyna] Do you like your work?

[Iliescu] Of course. Otherwise, I could not do anything.

[Ivshyna] Do you have a large family?

[Iliescu] No. But I have a lot of brothers and nephews. I live just with my wife. We do not have any children.

[Ivshyna] Do you have time for travel? Maybe you like to go hunting or fishing.

[Iliescu] No. I have not had time for such things during the last few years.

[Ivshyna] Let us make a small incursion into history. It is obvious that your destiny as a politician has obviously blended with the destiny of other personalities and prominent people. What was your relationship with Ceausescu, for instance?

[Iliescu] Not very close, although I worked with him directly for some six months in 1971, when I was secretary of the Central Committee [of the Romanian Communist Party]. Until then, we had pretty good relations because, at that time, he was one of the people who worked for openness in our political activity. That was a good time—the 1960's; I mean, when one can say that Romania was at the forefront of the political,

cultural, and economic openness as far as the countries in the East were concerned. In Romania and Czechoslovakia, people were talking for the first time about economic reform, market economy, and merging the plan with the requirements of life. A national conference on this subject was even held in 1967. However, the intervention in Czechoslovakia [Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968] was followed by a period of involution not only for the countries where Soviet troops were deployed but also for Romania. The political tension that emerged at the time was used by Ceausescu as a pretext for a new kind of policy based on the personality cult and on a hardening of the political regime. In 1971, I was in direct contact with him and our differences came to the fore. This happened after a visit he paid to certain Asian countries—to China and particularly North Korea. Afterward, he removed me from the political leadership....

[Ivshyna] Nevertheless, what is your opinion about him as a man?

[Iliescu] He had an intuitive intelligence, otherwise he would not have been able to advance so far, but he had a limited education and culture; actually, he was quite a primitive man. When he got hold of power and began to dominate political life, all these primitive trends came to the fore, that is to say the characteristics of a man who wanted to control and know everything.

[Ivshyna] This is an explanation that makes you understand such a phenomenon better. You see, many postsocialist countries are faced with a common danger, namely the danger of nostalgia for the past. What is your opinion on this? What kind of politics should one implement so as to prevent people from developing these feelings of nostalgia?

[Iliescu] This is quite a difficult thing to accomplish at such a time as this, when the economy has had to suffer a lot. The Romanian revolution occurred as a reaction of the people against very difficult living conditions. Right now, the situation for some people is even worse than then. The transition is creating such an amount of discontent that some people are beginning to think that it was better before, despite the dictatorship, since they at least had secure jobs and, although they lived modestly, they enjoyed a certain security. But now, when there is unemployment and inflation and the commodity prices keep going up with every passing day, certain people have become melancholic and are longing for the past. Such a danger exists and it can compromise the very idea of reform. Therefore, we are doing our best to make headway along these lines, but it is no easy thing to accomplish. We must get through a very tough period and must openly tell the people about the hardships inherent in the transitional period.

[Ivshyna] However, your meetings with the people have become rarer of late. Maybe it is not so comfortable to meet the people at a time when they are having such thoughts, to talk to them about unpleasant things, and tell them to be patient and work....

[Iliescu] No, it is not easy to do that, but it has to be done, and I must say that most of the people realize what is happening, although life is quite hard for them. On the other hand, there are also people who are exploiting such moments; I am basically referring to certain political forces and trade union leaders who are paid to do that.

[Ivshyna] What should one do to ensure that the government ship can sail on without being hampered by populist pronouncements?

[Iliescu] It is necessary to engage in a frank and constant dialogue with the people and tell them everything openly. When you are frank with the people, they are ready to understand you, even though it may be quite difficult for them to do this.

[Ivshyna] I had prepared a few more questions for you but I do not want to take up too much of your time. I would like to thank you for this discussion and ask you to say a few words for our Ukrainian readers.

[Iliescu] I would like to take this opportunity to convey my best wishes and my feelings of friendship to the readers of your newspaper. I would also like to express the hope that we will manage to cover this difficult road together, that we will create new and good living conditions for both our peoples, and that we will develop traditional good-neighborly relations between our countries.

[Ivshyna] Of course, it is very nice to have relations of friendship. Thank you.

Izetbegovic Views Tuzla Airport, Croat Army

AU0302182194 Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian 1624 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Interview with President Alija Izetbegovic by Amir Hodzic in Sarajevo on 3 February; monitored in progress—live]

[Text] [Hodzic] ...the two aforementioned prominent ladies [Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto and Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller] would like the situation concerning the delivery of humanitarian aid to our country to improve. I think that the reopening of Tuzla airport would to a great extent improve the humanitarian situation. After the talks at NATO headquarters in Brussels, let us recall, you said that the West was close to a decision on taking military action to open Tuzla airport and carry out the replacement of Canadian troops in Srebrenica. However, Butrus-Ghali is still opposed to the use of force, and this has not been done to the day.

[Izetbegovic] This has not been done, but I think that regardless of how much Butrus-Ghali and others oppose it, I think that Tuzla airport will be reopened at the end. Things are moving in this direction. I think that these things are now almost impossible to stop. There will still be some haggling over this, but I think that Tuzla airport will be opened by hook or crook. I think that the Serbian side will realize that they should not run the risk of being attacked from the air and that it will agree to this under certain conditions.

[Hodzic] They are obstructing it. In the past few days, the shelling by the Serbian aggressor has intensified in the area around the airport.

[Izetbegovic] Yes.

[Hodzic] They are doing this to show the international community that the airport is not safe.

[Izetbegovic] I visited this airport about a month ago. They are threatening the airport from some Crna Planina, Crni Vrh, or whatever it is called. I think this is the name of the hill where their artillery is. The hill from which they are controlling the airport is approximately 5 km away, as the crow flies. They know very well that if they put up resistance, this position would probably be bombed, silenced, and neutralized. I think that they will have to (?agree) to the opening of the airport. Regarding the replacement of the Canadian battalion in Srebrenica with the one from the Netherlands, I think that this will also be accomplished in approximately 15-20 days.

[Hodzic] Mr. President, regarding the humanitarian situation, the possible withdrawal of UNPROFOR [UN Protection Forces] and the UNHCR is frequently mentioned. What should be done in this situation, if it arises?

[Izetbegovic] First, I would like to say that this is a kind of blackmail at the time of negotiations. This is a kind of unfair blackmail, a blackmail through food with starvation. Our resistance is obviously resting on two factors—arms and food. Both of these factors, as you can see, are only partly in our hands. Only a small part of it is in our hands. Food is hardly in our hands altogether. We totally depend on humanitarian aid for food. This is something that is unfortunately in someone else's hands, in their hands. They are now trying to blackmail us through this food to force us to accept something that we should perhaps not accept.

However, we told them that in case they do decide to withdraw the troops, there would be no reason whatsoever for the embargo to remain in force. We demand and will demand that in case this decision is made, the arms embargo be lifted on the same day so that we can defend ourselves and they can go their own way.

However, assessing the future course of events, it does appears that they will stay here for some time. Therefore, in my view UNPROFOR will not be withdrawing soon, in the foreseeable future. I think that the situation will continue to develop more or less in the same way as it has been developing up to now. Food will be arriving in Bosnia-Herzegovina with a varying degree of difficulties. There has recently been some mention of a possibility of military helicopters escorting relief convoys. I think that this will come about. They would be able to remove the difficulties that could possibly (?arise). We recently sent our soldiers, our army, a letter in which we told them how important it was that we ourselves do not create any difficulties.

As you known, there was an attack near Zenica, the murder of a Englishman. This was actually supposed... this could only have been done by someone totally blind, deliberately (?blind), someone who is (?deliberately) working for someone else's interests.

[Hodzic] This second reason is more likely.

[Izetbegovic] This second is very likely to have been the case, because this was a direct attack on our main interest, namely to secure a normal supply of food. Some forces in the world were waiting for this to happen to raise the question of UNPROFOR's withdrawal, to use this as an argument.

We acted swiftly and we found those responsible. Unfortunately we cannot establish their motives [words indistinct] all three kidnappers [words indistinct] stopped. However, I think that there will be fewer difficulties in this respect in the future.

[Hodzic] The Presidency of our state recently proposed that Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia and Montenegro recognize each other. Would this be a fresh contribution toward the settlement of the crisis of the former Yugoslavia?

[Izetbegovic] Yes, this would certainly be a step forward if such mutual recognition did take place. We made that move but are not convinced that they will accept this. Of

course, we are making a political point because we are showing that we do not want war here. It is their turn now. They could accept it. That would be a step forward. They could reject it. This would then show that they have (?extreme) intentions concerning Bosnia-Herzegovina. If they really want peace, they ought to recognize Bosnia-Herzegovina and we will recognize them. We could then negotiate [words indistinct] Bosnia-Herzegovina, as we are negotiating now, but this would then be done from the position in which our borders are mutually recognized. I do not believe that they will respond positively to our move.

[Hodzic] Talking of Serbia and Montenegro, the two aggressor states against Bosnia-Herzegovina, many international agencies have recently written about the arrest of the Muslims and the leaders of the Party of Democratic Action [SDA] in Serbia and Montenegro. Do you have any more detailed information about what is really going on there? What do we want when it comes to Sandzak? Should the issue of Sandzak have been stressed more vigorously in the international negotiations?

[Izetbegovic] Yes, we have been trying to do that, but our words have always fallen upon deaf ears in that respect. We have been demanding that the representatives of Sandzak participate in the negotiations and are involved in the negotiations, but that has been rejected. We keep repeating this demand, and we will reiterate it at the next round of talks, that the Sandzak delegation be allowed to participate in the talks about the future of Bosnia-Herzegovina as an interested party. As for this court trial, it is meant to worsen the position of the Muslim people in Sandzak, both in its Montenegrin part and the Serbian part. The SDA members have been persecuted in both parts.

Two nights ago Montenegrin television showed pictures of a group of 12 people who had been arrested, and who were said to have had 13 rifles in their possession, as if they were going to undermine Montenegro and Serbia with these 13 rifles. That can convince no one. However, it can do something else. This is an extraordinary political exploitation of a case in which the entire Muslim nation has been accused of working against the state, of being one disloyal part of it, which should then be put against the wall. They have managed to do that. I think that the position of the Muslims in Montenegro and Serbia is very difficult. It was difficult even before, but now it has deteriorated so that no one feels any security [words indistinct] 12 people as far as I know, and the court trial [word indistinct], while over 50 people here [words indistinct].

We have lodged protests from here, to no effect most likely, but we have to draw the attention of the world to the very difficult position of a part of our nation in Serbia and Montenegro. This is an attempt to satanize a nation, to make other people revolt against it, and make life and existence impossible for the nation there. The trial that is in progress in Serbia and the one that is being prepared in Montenegro have that as the aim.

[Hodzic] Serbian mobilization has increased recently, particularly of Serbian refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina in Serbia. They have been forcefully mobilized and returned to the fronts in Bosnia-Herzegovina. What does that mean?

[Izetbegovic] You see, they have problems—we know that; their military might is suffering from a shortage of people and weapons. They have not had vast problems as far as weapons go, since they had stocks of arms. For 40 years the Yugoslav Army amassed arms in a paranoid way, spent huge amounts of money, and stockpiled arms for 40 years. Just in the region of Sarajevo—and I only established that later when I got here to this building—there were six or seven barracks just in the Sarajevo region, and barracks and warehouses of arms throughout the former Yugoslavia.

So they have never had problems with arms, but they have always had problems with the other element, manpower, and with the morale of that manpower. I think that this mobilization is an attempt to improve the situation in that respect, to find new youngsters to fight in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and that has more of a psychological aim—to raise the poor morale a bit. I do not think that this will significantly affect the balance of power [words indistinct].

[Hodzic] Let us go back now to our western neighbor, the Republic of Croatia, which—after overwhelming evidence of its open military deployment in Bosnia-Herzegovina—has officially been proclaimed the aggressor on our country. Mr. President, you have had a chance to get to know the Croatian politicians well. How can you explain this policy of theirs, a policy that has led to open armed intervention in Bosnia-Herzegovina?

[Izetbegovic] How to explain it? That is an interesting question, and the answer will be long in coming. But I would like to give you my private view here. Tudjman is obsessed about creating a Croatia with borders [words indistinct]. He is a historian, by the way, and one that not only studies the past but also lives in it. He cannot understand that this is not 1939, the eve of the World War II. If you remember, if you recall, that was the climate in which Bosnia-Herzegovina was so infamously partitioned, and this was on the eve of World War II. Fascism ruled in Europe. But democracy rules in Europe now, so the situation is completely different. In the old Yugoslavia there was a different balance of power, and the Muslims did not even exist as a political factor. Bosnia, as they say, fell silently then. But not this time. We are putting up a tremendous fight, and Bosnia is not falling.

Tudjman does not understand that, and he keeps pushing for this partition of Bosnia. We would have defended ourselves from the main culprit in the partition of Bosnia had it not been for this stab in the back from the west. After all, this has also damaged Croatia, since—from the Serbian aggression on Bosnia-Herzegovina—this diversion by the HVO and Croatia turned the

conflict into some kind of civil war with three warring factions, which in essence it is not. So the picture of this war has been distorted, and the international public has been confused about the character of the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. So the result of one vision from the past, of one obsession to create a Croatia with certain borders [words indistinct] thanks to such a balance of power, and generally the constellation of the powers in the world, which today cannot be established. Tudjman does not seem to want to see that. He is pushing for partition, and at the same time signing agreements with us, which we can see are not sincere, or is offering new arrangements. Meanwhile he is negotiating something else with Milosevic, something completely the opposite. We know that.

The Croatian Convention will be held here in two days, and I think that it will steer things in another direction, or at least we hope so. We know that the mood of the Bosnian Croats is not for such an option, nor is the mood of a large part of the Croatian public. Opposition parties and forces are against such a policy. Changes are probably ahead. We will follow this closely.

[Hodzic] Has President Tudjman perhaps stressed 1939 in your talks? I think it is important to point out that the Bosnia-Herzegovina Army did not exist then, and also that the existence of the Muslim nation was neglected in 1939. Now we have a completely different situation.

[Izetbegovic] Exactly. I have said so to Tudjman, particularly when he told me that we were faced with the threat of a bipartite partition of Bosnia. He said that what is on offer now is a tripartite partition of Bosnia, and we are being given a large part, the best part of Bosnia, and so on, but, he said, if you reject that, you are risking the danger of Bosnia being divided in two, just like in 1939. I told him that we did not have 200,000 soldiers then, that the Muslim nation was organized now, that this was the case now, and of course that plan will not wash.

[Hodzic] Tudjman's recent proposal for a union of Croatia and the Bosnian republic was rejected. If that proposal had referred to the two internationally recognized states, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia, would it have been accepted?

[Izetbegovic] To tell you the truth, this is an issue of great importance. None of us would have been authorized to accept that definitely. We would have probably turned to our Assembly and our public to decide whether that suited us. One kind of link with Croatia would certainly suit us, a firm link, because we are turned toward the West because we are driven in that direction in our development. We would have a link with the Western countries through Croatia. A sincere relationship based on equality and mutual respect would suit us, if such a relationship could be established. The public would probably be in favor of such a firm link with Croatia. The problem is obviously not between the nations but in the regimes. I do not know whether it is possible to arrange something with the current Croatian regime [words indistinct] a hypocritical policy. We have to be very cautious about every arrangement.

[Hodzic] After everything that the Serbian and Croatian aggressors have done to Bosnia-Herzegovina, particularly to the Muslim Bosniak people, will it be possible to preserve the multinational Bosnia-Herzegovina?

[Izetbegovic] That is a very hard question. I would say very briefly: We would have to have a bad case of amnesia for that. You know what that means [words indistinct] to forget, to forget many things, to wipe many things from the memory. Whether one case of amnesia or more would be needed, I do not know, but we will need to forget. Whether the people will be able to forget is another question.

[Hodzic] Could you briefly sum up the work of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Government led by Dr. Haris Silajdzic? You know how busy the government is, particularly as far as the humanitarian needs of the population are concerned. We spoke about that earlier. How do you assess the results of the work of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Government?

[Izetbegovic] I think we should wait a few more days for that. The government will then have been in office for 100 days, and it is common practice [words indistinct], after 100 days the government normally comes out in front of the Assembly or the public and reports on the results of its work. I think that the prime minister will come out with a report to the Assembly on 7 February. He will report on his results. Let us wait for that. Then we will see how realistic the results are. What can be seen now is that the government has finally started functioning, because we practically had no government [words indistinct] you could not have called that a government. That was more of a [word indistinct] body, which was paralyzed [word indistinct]. This government is without a doubt putting in a sincere effort to do something, and under very hard conditions, too [passage indistinct].

There is a division of duty, according to our laws. The division of authority is not so strict, but it is known that the Presidency has the final say in the field of foreign policy, the army, and interior affairs. So the foreign affairs, interior affairs, and the army are within the authority of the Presidency, the body that I chair. All other things are more or less within the authority of the government. The three fields, probably the most important ones [words indistinct] are within the authority of the Presidency. I think that the government has no problems when it comes to support; it has our full support. Everything it has proposed has been accepted without serious problems [words indistinct] nor will it have any in future, I hope [words indistinct].

[Hodzic] Mr. President, at the end of this program, I would like you to answer some questions that every so often tend to confuse the public. I am referring to the support of the Muslim countries to Bosnia-Herzegovina. How do you see this support, and is it sufficient?

[Izetbegovic] Regarding the support of the people, this support is general. This support is total and we are completely satisfied. Therefore, the Muslim people support Bosnia-Herzegovina and are profoundly interested in what is going on here.

Regarding the governments, the situation is not the same. Some governments do not support Bosnia-Herzegovina at all, while some are indifferent. These countries are in the minority. Some governments strongly support Bosnia-Herzegovina, although this number is not so great either. Some countries are extending support, (?limited) political and material support. Therefore, to be brief, there is a general support from the people and fairly selective support by the governments.

Nevertheless, one should say that this support is important and has perhaps been crucial for Bosnia-Herzegovina in all respects. We (?have) friends all over the world. We also have many friends outside the Muslim countries. However, the support from this category of countries, the Muslim countries, has indeed been crucial and decisive. I think that this support will continue. The Muslim world, which is an enormous world of a billion people, could have perhaps done more.

The prime ministers of Pakistan and Turkey, two very important countries, were here yesterday. I suppose Turkey will become a small giant in this part of the world. Turkey today has approximately 60 million people, and its national income is over $100 billion. This is a strong economic power whose strength is on the rise. This also applies to Pakistan. These two countries have over 200 million people alone. These two countries, for instance... Saudi Arabia must also be mentioned as a country that is helping Bosnia-Herzegovina; Iran, too, [words indistinct] then Malaysia is very important country, even though it is very far away, several thousand kilometers. We are in opposite time zones, so you can see how geographically far away this world is and yet it is very interested in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Ordinary citizens there know quite a bit about our situation. Their government is very interested. Indonesia is a very large country that is just beginning to display an interest in our problem. This is a big country with almost 200 million people; it has very strong potentials. All this is something that is of great importance (?for our country) right now and in the future.

[Hodzic] It is claimed that the support and help from these countries is more concrete than the declarative support of the countries in the West.

[Izetbegovic] We must not forget one thing regarding humanitarian aid. The help from the West is not negligible. For instance, regarding the sending of UNPROFOR troops, you must know that France is well represented, as is Britain. The Netherlands has also become well represented, while Canada used to be. I am sorry that the United States is not among them. This would then be a decisive factor.

So, we cannot ignore the help from the Western countries. This help is, of course, selective and is precisely worked out to maintain a balance, a situation in which they can dictate a political solution. They are not letting us significantly gain in strength so that we may set our own conditions. All in all, we are managing to somehow coordinate this help, to use this support for the survival of Bosnia-Herzegovina and prolong the resistance, to strengthen the defense.

[Hodzic] Mr. President, our program Open Studio is coming to an end. I would like to ask you whether, at the end of our program, you perhaps have a message for the people and the defenders of our country.

[Izetbegovic] Yes. I would like to say to our people and our defenders to keep going. I would like to express gratitude on the part of the government and the people for what they have done in the defense of the country. My message to the people is not to lose hope, for things will improve, that we are not alone in the world, and that, as you can see from what I said earlier, we have many friends, and that the cause for which we are fighting cannot be defeated.

[Hodzic] Mr. President, thank you very much for being a guest of Open Studio of the Radio of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Izetbegovic Reluctant To Attend Peace Talks

LD0302225394 Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Excerpt] Alija Izetbegovic, president of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Presidency, was the guest of today's Bosnia-Herzegovina Radio open studio. We will now broadcast President Izetbegovic's comments on the next round of the peace talks scheduled for 10 February in Geneva, the opening of Tuzla Airport, and on the possibilities that UNPROFOR [UN Protection Forces] and the UNHCR might withdraw from Bosnia-Herzegovina.

[Begin recording] [Izetbegovic] I am reluctant about going on the scheduled date. When they asked us whether we agree to the resumption of the talks on 10 February, I told David Owen that I most probably would not be attending these negotiations. Namely, I assessed at the time—and I still do—that this will be another futile attempt, a waste of time. Of course we have to take part. I am not sure whether we all have to go and waste time. I told them that Silajdzic would come with a delegation, fully authorized to negotiate. I might join in if I see there has been some progress and if Silajdzic informs me that things are going well.

I have many responsibilities here, so does Silajdzic, but someone has to stay; I believe it is me. Silajdzic is younger, so he can keep up with the pace. The pace at the negotiations is terrible, indescribable. Sometimes one works for 13 to 15 hours without a break—working, negotiating, haggling, and so on. The negotiations so far

have shown that there has been very little progress. I reckon that no miracle will happen on 10 February, but on the other hand that is not ruled out.

Now there is this four-part initiative from America, England, France, and Germany. It is expected that they could propose something new which would make a breakthrough at the negotiations possible. If that happens—the details of the initiative have not yet been revealed—I might decide to go, and the complete delegation will go to try to solve [word indistinct]. [passage omitted]

Serbs Demand Control Over Tuzla Airport Traffic

AU0302145994 Paris AFP in English 1445 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Belgrade, Feb 3 (AFP)—Serb forces would agree to the reopening of the airport at Tuzla in northeast Bosnia provided they can control all the traffic going through, a Yugoslav military official was quoted as saying Thursday [3 February]. Armed Forces spokesman Colonel Ljubodrag Stojadinovic was quoted by the Bosnian Serb news agency SRNA. The United Nations is considering authorising air strikes against besieging Serb forces to obtain the reopening of Tuzla, which is considered an essential channel for humanitarian aid.

Serbs Accept Truce, Plan 'Mini' Olympics

LD0302202394 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1805 GMT 3 Feb 94

["Pool" item]

[Text] Belgrade, Feb 3 (TANJUG)—The Bosnian Serb Republic (S.R.) on Thursday said it accepted the U.N.-proclaimed "Olympic truce" during the Winter Olympic Games held in the Norwegian town of Lillehammer February 13-19, adding that it would simultaneously stage its own "mini winter Olympics." The "mini winter Olympics" will be held on Serb-controlled Mount Jahorina near Sarajevo, as part of a ceremony marking the tenth anniversary of the Winter Olympics in Sarajevo, the capital of the former Yugoslav Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, said Ljubomir Zukovic, the S.R. minister of education, culture and sports and president of the S.R. National Olympic Committee.

Zukovic told a press conference in Belgrade that International Olympic Committee (IOC) Chairman Juan Antonio Samaranch had been asked to attend the games. "We should like him to pay us a visit and see for himself that we are not opting for war, but for restoring peace and multilateral cooperation," he added. To a question about what would happen if the Bosnian Muslims turned up with their own team to participate in the games, Zukovic answered that "if they did, it would mean they recognize us. In that case, we would be pleased to accept their presence. We do not want to compete with guns, but to separate our territories and try our strength at such contests."

"Mini winter Olympics" will comprise four events—slalom, giant slalom, cross country and biathlon.

Gruja Bjekovic, the secretary-general of the S.R. National Olympic Committee, said the Bosnian Serbs fully accepted the U.N. resolution proclaiming the "Olympic truce," although they could not vouch for the Moslem side to do the same. He added, however, that they had taken all precaution to provide maximum safety on Mt. Jahorina. Invitations had been sent to all countries which participated in the 1984 Winter Olympics in Sarajevo.

Bjekovic said that about 80 per cent of Olympic facilities was situated in the S.R. territory, and competitions would be held on the same pistes used by the world's best skiers ten years ago.

Djordje Perisic, secretary-general of the Yugoslav Olympic Committee (JOK), said his organisation fully supported the games on Mt. Jahorina adding that the Yugoslav team would take part in the games. The JOK would, by using its international connections, do everything in its power to bring to Mt. Jahorina as many participants from abroad as possible, Perisic said.

Seven Killed in Shelling of Sarajevo District

AU0402115294

[Editorial Report] Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian at 1100 GMT 4 February within its regular 17-minute newscast carries the following reports on the situation in Sarajevo. According to a communique from the Information Service of the 1st Corps of the Army of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina read by an announcer, "a calm morning in the Sarajevo region was interrupted by enemy artillery shells that ended their lethal flight in the region of Dobrinja. The aggressor fired them from the region of Vranjes. They were 82-mm mortar bombs. There were three bombs and Sarajevo has thereby added one more massacre to its list. The victims of this one are innocent civilians."

Jasna Niksic then reports live from Dobrinja that "so far seven people have been killed and 17 injured, of whom four are extremely seriously wounded and have been taken to the City Hospital. This is the balance of the morning Chetnik shelling in the Sarajevo Dobrinja district. Namely, the morning was extremely calm, but this calm was interrupted by two Chetnik shells that suddenly fell on Dobrinja One as civilians gathered to divide humanitarian aid. This is all the information we have now. We shall report with more details in our next newscasts."

Moslems Said To Use Civilians as 'Human Shield'

LD0302210194 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2017 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Zvornik, Feb 3 (TANJUG)—Moslems are exercising terror over Serbian and Croatian civilians in Tarcin, a locality in central Bosnia-Herzegovina, and plan to use them as a human shield in the offensive prepared against local Croat armed formations, Bosnian Serb military sources learnt from Bosnian Croat forces. The sources affirmed on Thursday [3 February] that many Serbs and Croats are incarcerated in Tarcin, while the rest have been moved to Zabrdje and Kiseljak, near Sarajevo, where they are forced to perform fortifications for the needs of Moslem armed forces.

According to the Croatian Defense Council (HVO), Moslems forces are planning in that region to use Serbian and Croatian prisoners as a human shield when they try to recapture from Bosnian Croats certain positions. Bosnian Serb military sources affirmed also that about one hundred Serbian families remaining in Zavidovici, a locality under Moslem control in central Bosnia-Herzegovina, are being terrorized and in danger of being massacred, if international especially humanitarian organizations do not come to their rescue in the shortest possible time. The sources, citing refugees who managed to escape, stress that the Serbian population in Zavidovici is constantly threatened by blackmail and brutal torture, while all the men even the ill are forcibly engaged by Moslem military and civilian authorities.

Serbs in Zavidovici, according to eye witness accounts, have been robbed of all valuable property, and Moslem authorities are excluding them from the distribution of international humanitarian aid.

Serbs Say Muslims Fired Two Chemical Bombs

AU0402083894 Belgrade Radio Beograd Network in Serbo-Croatian 0900 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] On the majority of the battlefields in the former Bosnia-Herzegovina provocative and offensive activities of the Muslim units toward the Serbian side have continued. From the direction of Kalesija two 120-mm projectiles filled with a chlorine-based chemical agent were fired at the Zelina region. The Serbian side has officially notified the command of the UN peace troops for former Bosnia-Herzegovina about this.

UN Commander Asks Croats To Stop Shelling Mostar

LD0302224694 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2013 GMT 3 Feb 94

["Pool" item]

[Text] Belgrade, Feb 3 (TANJUG)—The commander of the U.N. Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the former Yugoslavia, Gen. Jean Cot has called on the Bosnian Croats to stop continued shelling of the Muslim section of Mostar, a city in southwestern part of the war-torn former Yugoslav Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina. An UNPROFOR statement, a copy of which was submitted to TANJUG on Thursday, said the French general addressed such a demand to the commander of the Bosnian Croat army (HVO), Gen. Ante Roso, during his visit to Mostar earlier this week. Cot said no provocations by the local Muslim forces 'could justify the kind of retaliation endured by the population of Mostar (Muslim-controlled) east.'

The Bosnian Muslims and Croats, the erstwhile allies against the Serbs, have been waging merciless battles since the spring of 1993 for control over territories with a mixed Muslim-Croat population. According to Spanish U.N. troops' reports, Bosnian Croats in January fired more than 1,400 shells on the Muslim section of east Mostar, while Muslims fired no more than 75 shells on the Croat-held west Mostar.

Sarajevo Radio Reports Shelling

AU0402104994 Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian 0900 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Report by the Information Service of the 4th Corps of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Army]

[Text] The aggressor's formations of the Croatian Defense Council [HVO] and the Croatian Army have virtually not stopped artillery attacks in the zone covered by the 4th Corps in the last 24 hours. Ustasha fighters were attacking virtually all defense regions and the enemy fired dozens of projectiles from (?different) artillery pieces. Unlike their [word indistinct] practice so far, the ustashas especially intensified their artillery activities during [word indistinct] morning. In the region of Potocari in the north of the Mostar commune, over 50 mortar bombs of various calibers have been fired. Other regions in the north of the Mostar Commune, such as (Plice) and (Racici) were exposed to increased shelling, and the ustashas shot at the lines of separation with [word indistinct]. There was also no peace in the central parts of Mostar, so that about 30 projectiles, mostly mortar bombs of the largest caliber, have been launched on the district of (Dalic) alone in the last 24 hours. However, other Mostar districts have not been spared, because it has been registered that, late last night, the Ustashas fired several rockets at the village of (Jelice) from a multiple rocket launcher, and shells and mortar bombs were fired at all districts in the region of Pracevac. At the separation line, on the right bank of the Neretva River, along with increased fire from infantry weapons, 25 mortar bombs were also fired. Despite all the assaults by the enemy (?Ustasha) formations, all lines of separation in the zone covered by the 4th Corps have remained unchanged and stable.

Velika Kladusa Officials Ask Rebels To Give Up

AU0302161194 Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Report by Mirza Sadikovic]

[Text] The Velika Kladusa War Presidency today issued an appeal to its citizens, asking [word indistinct] residents and members of [Fikret Abdic's] paramilitary formations in particular to be sensible and to place themselves under the command of the Army of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Velika Kladusa has been experiencing unprecedented terror and (?suffering) under the veil of [word indistinct] quasi democracy for (?six) months, the appeal states. The peace that was established on 12 January has only partially helped us to alleviate the consequences of Abdic's insane idea.

We are most concerned by the fact that our town, your town, is now full of foreigners, who are pushing arms into people's hands, people who, for their own aims, have caused a fratricidal war. The arms that they have pushed into people's hands will always be an obstacle to peace and therefore we should listen to reason.

The appeal further states that Velika Kladusa has been burdened by about 2,000 orphans since 3 October last year, children whose fathers have been killed. They were forced into a struggle for some kind of a quasi state. There are many more children in this region who are without fathers. This should be a warning to listen to reason and find a peaceful settlement of the crisis, the appeal of the Velika Kladusa War Presidency states, asking its citizens, particularly members of the paramilitary formations, to be sensible and place themselves under the command of the Army of Bosnia-Herzegovina by 10 February of this year.

WFP Warns of Famine Risk Due to Blocked Convoys

AU0302173794 Paris AFP in English 1657 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Rome, Feb 3 (AFP)—The number of people threatened by famine in Bosnia is rising because of blocked food convoys, with only half available supplies getting through, the World Food Programme (WFP) warned here Thursday [3 February]. The population of central Bosnia is most at risk following delivery of only 28 percent of its food needs in December, added the UN food relief organisation, which is based here. Airdrops of food will be more than trebled to 3,600 tonnes a month to prevent a threatened spring shortage caused by the fact that only 65 percent of needed supplies are in place, the WFP said.

Throughout Bosnia, only half the available food aid reaches its final destination, the WFP added. Between 20 percent and 30 percent of children in the Moslem enclave of Maglaj, central Bosnia, are suffering from malnutrition, because of a Serb blockade of humanitarian relief, it said. Three quarters of the food aid required was parachuted in during November and December, but it was unknown how much actually reached the population, the WFP said.

Serbian Sources Claim Croatian Army in Bosnia

LD0302210294 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 2005 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Knin, 3 Feb (TANJUG)—Military sources in Knin [Serb Krajina, Croatia] claim that four guards' brigades of the Croatian Army are engaged in fighting in former Bosnia-Herzegovina—the First Zagreb Guards' Brigade, the Fourth Split Guards' Brigade, the Fifth Vinkovci Guards' Brigade, and the Ninth Rijeka Guards' Brigade. The same source quotes intelligence reports as saying that in addition to the Croatian Army's guards' brigades, Croatia has reserve units in the field—the 114th Split Brigade, the 123d Slavonia-Pozega Brigade, and the 128th Rijeka Brigade, as well as units of the 101st and 102d Zagreb brigades, and the 112th Zadar Brigade, numerically equivalent to one battalion. These units, military sources in Knin claim, are mainly engaged against Muslim forces from Stolac [in Herzegovina, southeast of Mostar] to Gornji Vakuf [in central Bosnia].

Prime Minister Denies Troops in Bosnia

LD0302202994 Madrid RNE-1 Radio Network in Spanish 1900 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] The question of the possible intervention of Croatian forces in the Bosnian conflict was the focus of a meeting in Zagreb between Spanish Foreign Minister Javier Solana and the Croatian prime minister. Solana ended his visit to former Yugoslavia this afternoon. Our special correspondent Pedro Fernandez Cespedes reports.

[Cespedes] Good evening. Croatian Prime Minister Nikica Valentic met Minister Solana and denied the direct intervention of regular Croatian troops in the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Spanish foreign minister was forceful and clear when it came to asking the question in Zagreb at midday today. Valentic gave an assurance that it is not the case and Javier Solana spoke about a different report.

[Begin Solana recording] Whatever the case may be, the UNPROFOR [UN Protection Forces] forces, the UNPROFOR commanders, say that Croatian troops have indeed been seen on the ground. [end recording]

[Cespedes] A negotiated solution to the problem of Srebrenica without the need for air strikes is on the way, and hopes of a similar—though more distant—outcome for the opening of Tuzla Airport have not been ruled out. These are the two most important pieces of information obtained by Minister Solana following his talks with the UN secretary general's representative for the military conflict in the former Yugoslavia, with whom he agrees that the threats of air strikes are bearing fruit.

Foreign Minister Denies Presence

LD0402014794 Zagreb HTV Television in Serbo-Croatian 2240 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Telephone interview with Mate Granic, Croatian deputy prime minister and foreign minister, by Zagreb Television correspondent; Granic in Rome—live]

[Text] [Correspondent] We have Mate Granic, Croatian deputy prime minister and foreign minister, on the phone line from Rome. Good evening, Mr Granic.

[Granic] Good evening.

[Correspondent] Thank you for granting us this interview, I know that you are very busy. First of all, could you tell me what is Italy's stand on sanctions against Croatia?

[Granic] Italy is concerned about the news on the presence of Croatian forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but it was also with great understanding that they accepted my explanations that these are only volunteers, and only up to 2,000 of them, and that there is a much larger number of volunteers from Islamic countries than Croatian volunteers in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Also, I explained that Croatia had no intention of initiating a military intervention, and that it suggested that all Bosnia-Herzegovina borders be supervised.

[Correspondent] Alright. You had this to say about the presence of volunteers. You therefore stick to your statement that there are up to 2,000 volunteers in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Can you comment on Butros Ghali's letter to the Security Council this evening in which he states that there are 3,000 to 5,000 soldiers of the regular Croatian Army in Bosnia-Herzegovina?

[Granic] They call the volunteers: elements of the Croatian forces—and that is the only difference. Concerning the figure of 3,000 to 5,000, they have received it from various sources, although not everyone agrees with these figures, including NATO.

[Correspondent] In addition to the sanctions, did you discuss with [Italian Foreign Minister] Mr. Andreatta what could happen at the EU meeting in Brussels on 7 and 8 February? Was there any talk of a new plan by the three members [of the EU]?

[Granic] The situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina will certainly be discussed at the meeting, but no discussion about sanctions has been envisaged. Likewise, a presidential communique is expected in the Security Council as well as a certain warning to Croatia, but no proposal of sanctions. Concerning the EU and the discussion they will have, an offer is expected from the EU for more efforts to be invested in organizing a meeting between the Croatian and Muslim sides, and an offer that representatives of the three important EU countries—Great Britain, France, and Germany—in addition to the United States, will be present at the meeting.

[Correspondent] However, it must be admitted that it is unlikely that any progress in that respect will be made, seeing that [Bosnian Foreign Minister] Mr. Ljubijankic's statement was made public this morning, and he is still insisting on the sanctions.

[Granic] You see, Mr. Ljubijankic is usually the one who voices the toughest statements of the Bosnian leadership. We believe, and we have had confirmation that there will be a meeting between the Croatian and Bosnian Muslim sides early next week.

[Correspondent] Talking about the improvement in relations between Muslims and Croats, will you perhaps mention some facts from the field. Namely, it is well known that Croats and Muslims are still fighting the Serbs together in some parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina, for example in Usora and Posavina.

[Granic] The basic aim of Croatia's policy is to stop all clashes between Croats and Muslims, without any preconditions, and also to establish a permanent peace, and not only peace, but also permanent cooperation, because that is in the strategic interest of both Croat and Muslim nations.

[Correspondent] OK. Thank you for now. Tell us just at the end what is awaiting you in Rome tomorrow.

[Granic] Tomorrow, I will have a meeting, that is, a reception with the Holy Father, and then with the state secretary, Cardinal Sodano, and the Vatican foreign minister, (Torano).

[Correspondent] Mr. Granic, thank you, and I wish you a successful day tomorrow.

[Granic] Thank you very much.

Envoy to UN Comments

LD0402003994 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 2300 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Mario Nobilo, the permanent representative of the Republic of Croatia in the United Nations has sent a letter to the Security Council [UNSC] chairman. The letter refers to the claims presented to the UNSC chairman by UN Secretary-General Butrus-Ghali in his letter dated 1 February. We will broadcast Nobilo's letter in its entirety.

My government does not deny that regular Croatian forces are deployed in the border areas between Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. They have been deployed there in accordance with the joint agreement between my government and the Bosnia-Herzegovina Government of 12 July 1992. The redeployment of those forces would put in serious jeopardy the territorial integrity and security of the Republic of Croatia. Considering the defense of towns on Croatia's Dalmatian coast, such a change in the balance of power in relation to the Serb side would put in serious jeopardy the support for the [Croatian] president's peace initiative, which is currently being discussed in the assembly, aiming at normalizing relations with Sarajevo and Belgrade.

My government cannot accept the simplified interpretation of the joint declaration with Belgrade of 19 January 1994 that the declaration is directed against the side that did not sign it [the Muslim side]. In fact, my president [Tudjman] proposed to the prime ministers of Turkey and Pakistan to mediate in the negotiations between the Croatian and Bosnian Muslim sides—as the Croatian side proposed in Bonn—before all sides resume their negotiations in Geneva scheduled for 10 February.

The Security Council will conclude that the joint statement by my government and Belgrade is fully in line with Security Council Resolution 871 from 1993, the CSCE final documents from Rome, and the EU's modus vivendi action plan of 22 November 1993, Nobilo said in his letter and added:

My government remains concerned for the well-being of the Croats, citizens of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, who are besieged by the Bosnia-Herzegovina Army in Vitez, Kiseljak, Usora, Zepce, and elsewhere. We have warned the Security Council on several occasions that the ethnic Croats, citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina, should be treated in the same way as the Muslims who are besieged in Srebrenica, Zepa, Gorazde, Sarajevo, Tuzla, and Bihac. The enclaves of Vitez, Kiseljak, Usora, and Zepce should be proclaimed protected areas in line with principles of Resolution 824 from 1993.

On 2 December 1993 and 24 January 1994, my government called on the Security Council to review the problem of large-scale violations of international humanitarian law committed by the [Bosnian] government forces, against Croats, citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Forces of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Army have carried out at least eight mass executions of Croats, citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina, since July last year.

Under such circumstances, when the Security Council has no means of protecting Croats, citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina, my government has no moral right to prevent Croat volunteers from helping the threatened community of Croats in Bosnia, who account for 18 percent of the Bosnia-Herzegovina population and have been forced into 10 percent of the territory. My government believes that a military solution to the problem of Bosnia-Herzegovina, or the problem of the UN protected areas in Croatia, is not acceptable, and in this respect it will continue supporting international mediation. We lend special support to international mechanisms supervising the number, presence, and intentions of the Croatian Army and Croatian volunteers in the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina. In this context, I would like to repeat the Croatian president's invitation to the Security Council of 16 July 1993 to supervise the Croatian and Bosnia-Herzegovina borders. Croatia will immediately give its support to such a mechanism.

If the Security Council is ready to suggest a better solution to the crisis in the area, than the one offered by the international conference on the former Yugoslavia, my government is ready to review their proposal. However, my government would like to warn the Security Council that any serious change in the balance of power in the area would derail the current process. In this respect, my government calls on the Security Council to give its full and unconditional support to the international conference on the former Yugoslavia, and especially to the Owen-Stoltenberg peace plan on Bosnia-Herzegovina, and to tell all interested parties that this is the only possible way to end the difficult human tragedy in the area.

This is said in the letter by Mario Nobilo, permanent representatives of the Republic of Croatia in the United Nations.

RSK Seeks Resumption of EU Negotiations

LD0202185794 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1710 GMT 2 Feb 94

[Text] Knin, Feb 2 (TANJUG)—President of the Republic of Serb Krajina (RSK) Milan Martic and a European Union delegation, headed by the new head of the E.U. monitors in the former Yugoslavia Konstandinos Yerekostopoulos, on Wednesday called for a resumption of the negotiating process for the resolution of the conflict between the RSK and the Republic of Croatia. Martic said in a talk with the E.U. delegation in Knin, the RSK's political centre, that the Serbs in the RSK expected of the E.U. monitors only objectively to report on the struggle of the Krajina Serbs for bare survival. Martic said the only way to assist the warring sides was to enable the RSK and Croatia to separate in a civilized manner and to live as two neighbouring states. Martic said it was an illusion to insist that the Krajina Serbs and Croats live in the same state. Peace must be achieved first and a political solution sought only then, Martic said.

Greek Ambassador Yerekostopoulos, for his part, said the talk was constructive. He set out that his country, which chairs the E.U. for the first six months of this year, would continue making efforts for the resumption of the peace process and its successful conclusion.

The ceasefire between the RSK and Croatia was last weekend extended until February 28. The 'Christmas' ceasefire agreement was reached on December 17 last year. The RSK was three years ago proclaimed on predominantly Serb populated territories of the then Croatia in response to Croatia's forcible secession from the former Yugoslav Federation and the attempt of its authorities to turn Serbs from a constituent people into a minority. Although the RSK has been a U.N. Protected Area (UNPA) since March 1992, Croatia has carried out aggression on it three times since in the hope of establishing its authority there.

Zhirinovskiy Views Solutions to Bosnian War

AU0402125594 Zagreb GLOBUS in Serbo-Croatian 4 Feb 94 pp 6-8, 47

[Interview by Vlado Vurusic with Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, leader of the Russian Liberal Democratic Party, in Bled; date not given: "Four Countries Will Emerge on Territory of Former Yugoslavia: Greater Croatia, Greater Serbia, Greater Macedonia, and Little Slovenia With Trieste"]

[Text] While the boat floats calmly on the cold Lake Bled, Zhirinovskiy, completely relaxed, explains how sex and morals influence politics. "A man and a woman," Zhirinovskiy says, eating a mandarin slowly, "have two ways of establishing a relationship—either by consent, or the man rapes the woman. So, today in Russia, you have politicians, like Gaydar, for example, who rape the country, rape the economy. We do everything slowly, which is the result of my way of life and my eating habits, and that is why the Russians rejected the barbarians and the crooks at the elections. They tell us that we give them hope, and they no longer want to put up with Gaydar's deceptions. We are for true democracy. So far, we have had democrats-hermaphrodites in power." Zhirinovskiy quickly switches from politics to women. He says that he likes calm and quiet women that do not smoke, do not drink, and do not wear makeup, women that knit and do embroidery. "I particularly like women that moan and weep during intercourse, but women that cry out 'More, more,' I do not like them, that is no longer democracy," Zhirinovskiy explains his sexual philosophy.

We continue the conversation in his presidential suite. Since the translator he asked for did not come, Zhirinovskiy asked me to translate for him the declaration given to him for signing by [Slovene National Party leader] Zmago Jelincic.

The fifth point of that declaration contains Jelincic's proposal that Zhirinovskiy should help Slovenia move the Slovene-Croatian border in Istria to the Mirna River.

"What do you think about that?" Zhirinovskiy asked me. I told him that it was not fair for everybody to snatch parts of Croatian territory. "Besides, you said that you are against the changing of borders," I said. "You are right," Zhirinovskiy said without much interest, but he theatrically crossed out the fifth point of the declaration, which in the end was left out from the document.

When most of the reporters had left Lake Bled, Zhirinovskiy invited a British reporter, a Norwegian one, and I to join him in the sauna and the pool, where—in an atmosphere of sweat and burning brains—he chatted about his political views regarding the world, and his intended trips to Spain, Turkey, and Poland. The conversation and the photo session in the pool and the trim-cabinet confirmed his eccentricity. Zhirinovskiy wanted us to play with him, who can stay under water longer, who can dive, jump the longest, lift more weights. All this bewildered the cold-blooded and condescending British colleague. He finally left without saying goodbye, while we had another drink by the pool (Zhirinovskiy had a soft drink). We completely lost awareness of the fact that we were in the company of a controversial and bizarre politician, seen by many as a very dangerous possible initiator of a third world war.

[Vurusic] Mr. Zhirinovskiy, the 13 million votes that you got make you a very important politician. Is not everything we witnessed at Lake Bled just an eccentric show?

[Zhirinovskiy] No, politics should be like that. You have to be sincere and open in politics. I am open, I hide nothing. During these last few days reporters have been following me freely. They have photographed me eating, walking, swimming, talking. I am like that. In politics, as in nature, there can be volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, hurricanes. I want to prevent that. I am very peace-loving, although there are constant attempts to smear me with mud. Actually, in order to prevent even worse consequences of the present situation, I am prepared to apply somewhat harsher measures. Sometimes a little violence has to be applied to prevent a lot of violence.

[Vurusic] Russia's public prosecutor has brought charges against you for spreading hatred and for war-mongering?

[Zhirinovskiy] That is all nonsense. They want to get rid of me, they want to discredit me because I won the elections, and because I will become the president of Russia after the next elections. I am in favor of a peaceful solution to all issues, and I have been fighting with all my might to find a peaceful solution to this bloody war in the Balkans. The events in the former Yugoslavia are, in a way, a preamble to what certain circles would like to see happen to us in Russia.

[Vurusic] Your views about the war in the former Yugoslavia have been causing some confusion, and even dismay. How do you see this war? Is it true that you support the Serbian side?

[Zhirinovskiy] It hurts me to see our brother Slavs killing each other. I love the Slovenes, the Croats, and the Serbs equally, and that is why I think that this war has to be stopped, but in a peaceful way. Our party has several solutions to stop the war. Believe me, it is no coincidence that it is the Slav countries that have disintegrated, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and the USSR.

[Vurusic] You told me in Moscow that you would like to see the reintegration of Yugoslavia, but that you would not insist on that. What does that mean?

[Zhirinovskiy] Why do you not want to be a powerful Slav state? There are 300 million of us Slavs! We are a force. Why should they constantly divide us, why should we wage wars, why should we defend the West from invasions from the East? All right, Yugoslavia does not have to be reintegrated if you do not want it so, but you must not fight. We, the Slavs, we have to stick together. If you do not want to be together, then three states can be formed: Slovenia, greater Croatia, and greater Serbia.

[Vurusic] You did not answer whether you nevertheless support the Serbs in this war?

[Zhirinovskiy] No, I do not support the Serbs, I support the Slavs. Perhaps the Serbs are closer to us, the Russians, because of religion. Besides, the Serbs love us and we have helped them a lot throughout history. However, I repeat, I also love the Croats and the Slovenes.

[Vurusic] You are going to Serbia, but not to Croatia?

[Zhirinovskiy] I would have gone to Croatia if I was invited. Actually, the representatives of one of your parties, with whom I met in Bled, have invited me now. I will come, of course, and I will tell your president to negotiate. I will say the same thing to Milosevic.

[Vurusic] What kind of solution do you offer for the end of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina?

[Zhirinovskiy] The foreign troops, including the UN forces, must first leave Bosnia-Herzegovina. The possibility of any sort of foreign involvement in the clashes, especially the possibility of an intervention against only one side—the Serbian side—must be eliminated. Afterward, clashes must be ended and the status quo frozen. If you wish, we can send the Russian battalions to stand between the warring sides and guarantee that there will be no more clashes.

[Vurusic] By freezing the status quo, Serbia will get the greatest part of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

[Zhirinovskiy] What is wrong with the Serbs getting the largest part of the territory? In this way they will grow into a force that will defend Europe from the Islamic fundamentalism, from the invasion of Islam toward the heart of Europe. Serbia will defend you from new wars and poverty. What will happen when the Turks advance via Bulgaria toward Europe one day? Somebody should stop them. The Serbs being in Bosnia-Herzegovina is like a flu, as they are preventing the spreading of AIDS to Europe. Better a flu in Bosnia than AIDS in Europe. Beside, one of the solutions is a greater Croatia and a greater Serbia in the Balkans.

[Vurusic] What do you mean?

[Zhirinovskiy] Let there be a greater Croatia, naturally slightly smaller than the greater Serbia. Three states should exist in the Balkans: little Slovenia, perhaps with Trieste, then Croatia with roughly half of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and greater Serbia.

[Vurusic] Will "krajina" be part of the greater Serbia?

[Zhirinovskiy] Whose is "krajina" actually?

[Vurusic] Croatia's.

[Zhirinovskiy] Good, then let it stay in Croatia while Serbia can get a part of Albania.

[Vurusic] What about the Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina?

[Zhirinovskiy] What Muslims? They do not exist as a nation. They are an invention. How do I know what will happen to them, they can move to Iran!

I would like to stress the following: If the borders start to change then what I call Europe 2000 will emerge, and within it the Balkan pyramid. In principle, I am opposed to changes of borders, however, it they do start to change, they should change everywhere and not only in the Slavic countries. I have proposed the borders from 1900, 1918, 1945, 1975, or 1994 to the West. If the West does not want this, then my message to them is—O.K. it is time for the borders of the year 2000. This time around, the Slavs must not come off badly again, but must change borders to our advantage.

[Vurusic] What is the Balkan pyramid?

[Zhirinovskiy] Little Slovenia with Trieste. As I have heard here, Trieste is rather controversial. Initially, a "free town" model can be applied, similarly to the free royal towns that existed in Europe in the past. Numerous towns in Europe, also in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Nagorno Karabakh, even Vukovar, about which I am constantly being asked questions ever since it has been learned that I will visit it, could get this status. Once the system of "free towns" is setup, the interested parties should agree peacefully what will go to whom. Anyway, to continue. Within Europe 2000 and the Balkan pyramid, Tirol must go to Austria. Italy will be a little debilitated, but we should help it in Sicily around its problems with the Mafia. The top part of the Balkan pyramid is Slovenia, the next, somewhat bigger, Croatia with a part of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the third, Serbia with Montenegro, the greater part of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and a part of Albania, while the last and the fundamental part of the pyramid will form the biggest country—Macedonia with its capital in Sofia—which will stretch from the Adriatic sea to the Black and Aegean Seas. It will entail a part of Albania, Macedonia, Greek Thrace, Bulgaria, and the Romanian Dobrogea. In return the Greeks would get Cyprus, Gallipoli, and the Turkish islands in the Aegean Sea. Hungary with Transylvania would also be linked to this pyramid, however, this will happen later.

[Vurusic] You intend to accomplish all this without a war?

[Zhirinovskiy] All this can be resolved very easily. In the first phase, new Slovenia, greater Croatia, and greater Serbia will be created. Then it will be Macedonia's turn. True enough, the question of Austria can be resolved in the first phase, although it does not have such a complex situation as the countries of former Yugoslavia. The safety of these countries will be guaranteed by five Russian corps. One in each country. There would be no more war and you could concentrate on trade.

[Vurusic] How will you react if NATO nevertheless attacks the Serbian positions in Bosnia-Herzegovina?

[Zhirinovskiy] We shall oppose it adamantly. We will demand through our parliament and our diplomacy that

intervention definitely be prevented. If need be, Russia will threaten to leave the UN.

[Vurusic] The Italians will probably be surprised that you wish to give Trieste a similar status to Vukovar?

[Zhirinovskiy] You see, there are numerous problematic areas in Europe, which should be marked. These are: the Basque Province, Catalonia, Tirol, Lvov, and Dniester, and Nagoro Karabakh. If we approach border changes, we must mark exactly all the problematic areas and give them a special status. Afterward, we will agree to whom what will go.

[Vurusic] What will you say in Vukovar? Is this a Croatian or a Serbian town for you?

[Zhirinovskiy] I will say that we, the Slavs, must not kill each other. I will seek that the Serbs agree with the Croats about the status of Vukovar peacefully. I will say that I shall do everything within my power to have the sanctions against Serbia lifted. Beside, I will advocate that sanctions not be imposed on Croatia, which some in the world demand. Why do they demand sanctions against Croatia? To exhaust yet another Slavic country and prolong the war.

Had the West cared about ending the war in the Balkans, it would not have demanded the isolation of Serbia and Croatia. The Serbs and the Croats must negotiate, and if they do not want to, the case of Northern Ireland will repeat itself. Little countries are dangerous, they merely escalate the possibility of clashes and wars and that is why I am sorry that Yugoslavia has disintegrated. In 1990, I was in Ljubljana, Zagreb, and Belgrade. I liked the towns and the people, however, now you are at war and in order to get from Ljubljana to Belgrade I have to travel via Hungary.

[Vurusic] So you nevertheless wish for the reconstruction of Yugoslavia?

[Zhirinovskiy] I think that this is the best. Why are you fighting? All the Slavs should be united. Like the Communists used to say—Proletarians of all countries, unite!—I call on you: All Slavs, unite! Nobody will be able to do a thing to us. However, I will not insist on Yugoslavia if that is the way you agree. It is your decision how you will link up: A federation, a confederation, or nothing at all. As I have said earlier, there are three countries, while other parts of the former Yugoslavia will enter one of these three countries. On these territories, either Yugoslavia or the Balkan pyramid, as I have proposed it, is possible.

[Vurusic] Why did you come particularly to Slovenia?

[Zhirinovskiy] There are parliamentary holidays right now and my friend Petar Ivanovich invited me to come here to rest. I need a rest, but I must again defend myself from attacks that I am a fascist. You see that I am not a fascist! I only want peace and happiness for the Slavs. I wish this to all other nations. To Russia I wish that it finally overcomes the chaos in which it is currently.

[Vurusic] However, you are feared in the West and in Russia?

[Zhirivnoskiy] Let them fear me, we have feared and curtsied to the West long enough. They fear me in the West because I speak the truth and fight for a more just solution. Why is America meddling in European affairs when it does not belong here? Why all this bowing to the West? In what way is Russia worse than the West? Is our culture poorer? Of course not. Is our Russian man less talented? No. Are our women less pretty than in the West? Those hermaphrodite democrats who are afraid of the true Russia are afraid of me.

[Vurusic] I would return to the issue of Bosnia-Herzegovina. What about the Muslims, who are a majority ethnic group in Bosnia? Do you really want them deported to Iran?

[Zhirinovskiy] We have the same problem with the Muslims in Russia. The Muslims would like to take over Europe and they would like to do it through a Muslim state in the heart of Europe. I have nothing against the Muslims, let them live according to their traditions and Muslim laws. However, then they do not need television, roads, contacts with the Christians. Let their women wear a veil from the age of 12, let them bow five times a day, and live in their houses. They should not print books because they say that everything they need is written in Koran, anyway. I have nothing against them living in accordance with their customs. However, I think that they cannot live like this in the heart of Europe.

Federal

Factories To Receive DM200 Million From State

AU0302171494 Belgrade POLITIKA in Serbo-Croatian 3 Feb 94 p 11

[Article by A. Apostolovski: "Two Hundred Million Dinars for Reviving Production"]

[Text] If we are to believe the words of Momir Pavlicevic, republican minister for industry, at yesterday's meeting with managers of large industrial concerns in Belgrade, Serbian factories can count on some 200 million new dinars (German marks) in "heavy" financial support as early as next week. The meeting was held in the capital's Chamber of Commerce.

The minister said that talks between the government, its expert team, and banks were drawing to a close, and that the "plan for reviving production would be finished and ready for implementation" by Monday. The plan envisages establishing a fund, half of which—100 million dinars—would be secured from the banks' foreign currency reserves, while another 50 million would come from the reserves of companies that will have to put it onto the market, Minister Pavlicevic said. The remaining 50 million will be secured from advance payment for the companies' products that are being manufactured. Yesterday, several assessments of the funds needed to revive production in the mainly idle factories were made. Rade Borojevic from the city Chamber [of Commerce] said that 208 million German marks [DM] were needed for this endeavor, and that these funds would be invested in 13 companies. The economy has only 24 percent of these funds. Rade Kolakovic, assistant manager of Beobanka, estimated that during the first three months, some DM500 million should be secured to help 60 companies. He warned that even five or six former Yugoslavias would not be enough to satisfy the industrial and labor capacities, and asked which criteria would be applied in dividing the sweet 200 million cake [as published].

The managers of Belgrade industry agreed on one thing yesterday: Economy and production must be put on the agenda and they must receive the funds.

We must have the money by the end of next week in order to revive the production, said IMT [expansion unknown] manager Ljubomir Stevanovic. "Not a single pensioner, policeman, or civil servant (who has received the money) will be buying a tractor or combine harvester, but bread and milk. Why wait, if we get the loans, we should reopen Rekord [not further specified] as well. We also have a shortage of tires. This can be solved by freeing the merchant banks," said Stevanovic [as published].

According to him, the social situation in the factories is highly inflammable, and the workers are exhausted. He said that the majority of Belgrade factories had not even paid out half of the December salaries.

In terms of production, we have lost two months, warned Slobodan Maric, manager of the Zemun-based Zmaj plant.

Talking about the current problems that the companies face, Milan Samardzic, manager of the Industry of Metal Products from Zemun, said that the net revenue of his factory equaled the electricity bill, and was smaller then the funds needed for the monthly public transport tickets of his workers. He asked who had allowed the GSP [expansion unknown] to reintroduce social policy in companies.

In response to the managers' many questions, Minister Pavlicevic stressed that the program's priority task was to create real resources for filling the budget, that is, reviving production. He said that the "budget must be leveled out by May."

Last year, 98 percent of money issued into circulation went into the budget. This will not be repeated this year. We shall invest in companies that have a short production cycle, and those that manufacture finished products. In this way we will also revive the associated companies, said the minister.

According to him, the price of public utilities will be decreased next week, because the government has calculated that prices are not based on the population's real wages.

Ministry Explains Funding

LD0402115994 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1128 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] Belgrade, Feb 4 (TANJUG)—The Serbian Government has announced that industrial producers should receive 200 million new dinars (equivalent to 200 million deutsche marks) in the next two weeks for reviving production which has been at a stand-still since international economic sanctions were imposed on the country nearly two years ago. The step is just one of production-boosting measures envisaged under a programme of reconstructing the monetary system and healing the economy of Yugoslavia (Serbia/Montenegro).

The programme, launched on Janury 24, has already given results, curbing what was a world record inflation and improving supply on the market. The businessmen warn, however, that funds are low for swinging the production cycle anew. The 200 million dinars should be paid out of a fund that should be set up for financing the economy, one-half of the money to be put up by the banks' hard currency reserves, and the balance by the firms by selling stock-piles and buying futures. However, not all of Serbia's 199,500 firms can hope for a financial injection, but only the manufacturers of easily marketable goods, Serbian Industry Minister Momir Pavlicevic has told TANJUG.

Yugoslavia is implementing its monetary and economic recovery programme alone, without any outside assistance and in conditions of draconic international sanctions, the worst ever imposed on any nation, with its firms banned from the world markets for both import and export of commodities and fuel.

Protest To France Over Ban on Pro-Serb Rally

LD0402120594 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1043 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] Belgrade, 4 Feb (TANJUG)—The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has, with amazement and bitterness, received reports that the prefecture of Le Bas Rhin in France has made a decision to ban the rally entitled "24 Hours of Solidarity With the Serbian People," scheduled to take place on 6 February. The Ministry's statement says that the explanation that "a protest rally against the sanctions affecting the Serb community could threaten public order due to the risk of counterdemonstrations by associations hostile to the Serbs or by those associations whose aims contradict those of the rally organizers" is particularly surprising. The explanation and other circumstances indicate that the competent prefecture could not have made the decision without the consent of the French Government.

Such measures by the French authorities point to the existence of double standards which some countries, and—unfortunately—France among them, apply to the crisis in the former Yugoslavia. The decision to prohibit the Serbs from expressing legitimate protest and dissatisfaction against the unfounded and genocidal sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Serb people gives even more reason for concern, bearing in mind that such measures have never been taken against anti-Serb demonstrations in France.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Yugoslav citizens who live and work in France, and the entire Yugoslav public, rightly expect that the relevant authorities in France will reexamine their decision and enable Yugoslav citizens and their French friends to express their viewpoint on the sanctions in a peaceful and dignified manner. Following the surprising decision by the French authorities the Federal Foreign Ministry has ordered the charge d'affaires of the Yugoslav Embassy in Paris to lodge a protest note with the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the statement says.

Macedonia

Daily Claims U.S. Troops Involved in Incident

AU0402072294 Paris AFP in English 0406 GMT 4 Feb 94

[Text] Skopje, Feb 4 (AFP)—US troops serving with the United Nations, many of whom had been drinking, provoked a scuffle with police here last month, the newspaper VECER reported on Thursday [3 February]. It said the January 28 incident occurred after a confrontation between an American UN soldier and a plainclothes policemen, during which the latter was insulted despite having made known his profession. In an ensuing brawl involving some 20 UN troops and Skopje police, witnessed by several passersby, a shot was fired but caused no casualties, according to the paper. It did not say who had been responsible for the shot. UN military police then intervened to end the scuffle, after meeting resistance from U.S. forces, according to Vecer. Macedonian and United Nations officials, embarassed by the affair, refused to comment on the report, other than to say that the incident was under investigation.

An estimated 1,000 UN troops, 315 Americans and 700 from Scandinanvian countries, have been deployed in Macedonia to prevent the republic from getting caught up in the conflict raging elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia.

Russia Establishes Diplomatic Relations

AU0402091194 S[illegible]pje MIC in English 3 Feb 94

[Unattributed report: "Diplomatic Relations Established Between the Russian Federation and Republic of Macedonia"]

[Text] "The Russian Federation established diplomatic relations with the Republic of Macedonia at embassy level on 31 January," the undersecretary at the Foreign Ministry Viktor Gaber states at today's press conference. Gaber announced that a high government delegation of the Russian Federation will arrive in Macedonia at the beginning of March, which is also when the embassy will be opened in Skopje.

In its announcement, among the rest, the Macedonian Foreign Ministry says: "The Russian Federation was among the first to recognize the Republic of Macedonia under its constitutional name, and sponsored the resolution for the acceptance of our country to the United Nations. The support from the Russian Federation of Macedonia's request for admission as a full member of the CSCE has been continuous, which represents a clear confirmation that an independent and sovereign Republic of Macedonia is an unsurpassable factor of peace and stability in the region, and broader in Europe."

As it is known, the Russian Federation recognized the Republic of Macedonia in August, 1992, while it is establishing diplomatic relations after a year and half. Otherwise, the Republic of Macedonia has been recognized under its constitutional name by 11 other countries, besides the Russian Federation.

Diplomatic Relations Established With Czechs

LD0302180694 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1657 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Text] Skopje, 3 Feb (TANJUG)—The Czech Republic informed the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia today that the government in Prague has reached a decision on the establishment of full diplomatic relations with Macedonia at ambassadorial level, it was announced in Skopje today.

Commenting on the news disclosed in Moscow on the establishment of diplomatic relations at the level of embassies between the Russian Federation and Macedonia, Russian envoy in Skopje Yuriy Petrovich said in a statement for Skopje Radio that Russia would mediate in the Macedonian-Greek dispute if asked to do so.

Albanians Consider Boycotting Census

AU0402074694 Tirana TVSH Television Network in Albanian 1900 GMT 3 Feb 94

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia will soon conduct its census. In this framework, it is very important to know the exact number of Albanians living there. The government there has been, and is, creating obstacles regarding the exact number of Albanians. For more details, we have invited Bujar Muharremi into our studio:

[Muharremi] It is true that a census is expected to be conducted in Macedonia during April. Much has been and is still being spoken about this problem. There are malicious anti-Albanian attitudes, and there are also manipulations. This census is especially important for determining the status of the Albanian people living in the ancient land of their forefathers. This is a census that will show whether the number of Albanians living in Macedonia is 40, 20, or 22 percent as declared by the Macedonian officials. This census will show whether the Albanians are a state-forming people in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The Albanian Government has expressed its support for a correct census, in the presence of international observers to ensure that it is accurate and convincing. This census should be conducted in such a way as to ensure the full participation of the Albanian people. However, there are several facts that account for the obstacles that have been put in place to prevent the full participation of Albanians in this census. The top Macedonian authorities have decided that the persons who will take part in the census should have passports issued during 1993 or after. [passage omitted]

Thus, if a person does not have a passport issued during this period, he will automatically loose the right to be registered. This problem becomes more acute if we consider that hundreds of Albanians can come from Western European countries, where they are temporarily employed, to be registered. Thus, it will be almost impossible for them to take part in this census.

Reports from Macedonia confirm that, every day, hundreds and hundreds of Albanians gather near the police stations waiting to get new passports, so as to be able to register. There are even reports, such as those coming from Tetove and Gostivar, that the police have used violence against Albanians who want to have new passports as soon as possible in the face of delaying actions by the Macedonian authorities.

Let us point out something else. The enrollment commissions are not allowed to compile lists in two languages, in Albanian and Macedonian. This creates the conditions for manipulation, especially in those cities such as Prelep, Manastiri i Rese, etc., in which the population is mixed or where the majority is Macedonian. Under these conditions, we can pose the question: Do the Macedonian officials favor a correct and convincing census of Albanians and will they create the conditions for a normal census of the Albanian people? On the contrary, the Albanians in Macedonia, as they have ascertained, will boycott this census. However, let us wait and see what the future will bring regarding this problem.

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 352
MERRIFIELD, VA.

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, military, economic, environmental, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available sources. It should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal names and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Central Eurasia, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735,or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.